NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCLII.

JULY, 1894.

THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS.

BY EX-SPEAKER REED.

THE present administration has been in power a year and four months. This would ordinarily be a very short period by which to judge of its value to the people of this country. But since March, 1893, events have moved so rapidly and have been of such serious import that most men's minds are already settled as to the verdict which will be rendered whenever the opportunity is offered.

In fact, the verdict, so far as that means the concentrated opinion of men everywhere, has already been rendered. So uniform has been the expression of opinion that all who speak to the people on this subject are entirely relieved from the need of arguing the question, and are forced to confine themselves to mere comment, unable even in that to avail themselves of the things which were most striking because those things have been worn out by the tireless discussion which has ensued. We have had plenty of leisure for discussion. Business has not distracted our thoughts.

It is true that the course of human history shows many changes from prosperity to adversity, and perhaps it is too much to hope that the time will ever come when the race will be exempt from periodic disaster even as severe as that which is upon us now. Nevertheless, if we are ever to have a more uni-

Copyright, 1894, by LLOYD BRYCE. All rights reserved.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

form course of prosperity, it must come from such consideration as we may be able to give to the causes which lead to our misfortunes and the incidents which attend them. Knowledge of the disease is the first preliminary to the invention of remedies. Party government being so evidently the sole kind of government possible in any country at all free or civilized, it is strange that men do not grasp the idea and keep it always in their minds that what governs a country is not the individual or individuals who occupy prominent places, but the party which surrounds and supports them; the party, the sentiments of which are really the guiding and controlling force. Human beings are so constituted that each leans upon the other, and all upon each. Of course the sentiments of the party out of office are not without their force, even upon those apparently holding the reins of power; but the main impulse for good or ill comes to an administration from those which immediately surround it. It has in itself very little original power. Of course it may get strength from the whole people, and that strength on particular things may be so great that party may be overridden and measures may become law which party policy does not dictate, but this can only be when the party itself is so discordant and broken that it can hardly be called a party.

For many years the Republican party, under administration after administration, pursued a course so proper and suitable as a whole that the deserved praise bestowed upon it became a rock of offence, and the sneer injected into the words "pointing with pride," which we had justly placed in our platforms, did us more harm than our good works could cancel. In this envious world more than one Aristides has gone into banishment because the world got tired of hearing him called the Just.

When the Democratic party came into power there were not a few of those who had voted against it who gave themselves some consolation in the hope that the possession of power would work in that party a change which would be of advantage to the whole country. Being out of power a long time makes the members of a minority party unreasonable, suspicious, and incapable of those sensible allowances which must be made for the shortcomings of those in office. They get to think of their opponents not as misguided, but as wicked. Nor can you ever entirely exclude a minority from influence. Even their unjust out-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cries have their effect. Hence there were those who hoped that an experience of the difficulties of government would so press upon the newcomers, that, steadied by due sense of responsibility, they would unite upon some reasonable course of conduct which, while it might not be of the best, would at least not be of the worst.

This consolatory hope has hardly been realized, and yet the experience which the Democracy have had in misgoverning the country, conjoined with that rebuke which the country seems so likely to administer promptly at the first opportunity, may secure to us hereafter an opposition less gangrened with envy and more reasonable in its estimate of the doings of those who have the problems of government to solve and its responsibilities to encounter.

At the same time the country at large, and especially those men who pride themselves on being above partisanship, will learn that there are odds in parties, and that it is not the proper subject of a toss-up which they will have.

Of course, we all knew as a matter of theoretical knowledge that the only way in which its ablest leader could seem to bring his party under one tent was to invent that charming phrase, "I am a Democrat," which served at once as a designation and an evasion; but we were very far from having a realizing sense of the real discord which reigned throughout. It is not by words, but by actions, that men show what they think.

It has been owing to this discord and lack of agreement among their opponents the past year that those who were the rulers of this country from 1861 to 1893 have been able to show to the people that whether in power or out of power they have the same good sense which rendered the history of the American people between those dates a history of prosperity and progress unequalled by any other thirty years. Whenever there has been any portion of the Democracy large enough to enable us to turn the scale to the side of right and good government, the Republican party has not been wanting to the country.

The history of the last year must have been a bitter disappointment to many good men who, not satisfied with a reasonable amount of good government, sought to find a future better than the past, by throwing themselves into the hands of a party which was and is the creation of pure opposition, a party which had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never been for anything in particular, but simply against everything in general. How these men could have hoped for anything but the dismal result which now darkens the country they are probably at this moment asking themselves with more of anger than of sorrow. Of course these men, and with them many partisans of long standing, are now repenting with exceeding bitterness of spirit. They are also bringing forth works meet for repentance. No election, however trivial, which gives men a chance to show their feelings has been neglected. Wherever the elections have been on a scale great enough, the disgust of the people has taken on the largest possible proportions, and the people have not failed to emphasize what they meant. In Oregon, where the Populists hoped to render the verdict uncertain, the voters have left no doubt and given no sign which could be mistaken.

What a horribly disappointed country it is, and has a right to be! Read over Mr. Cleveland's inaugural, which perhaps contained his aspirations and the hopes he had of the future he was about to enter upon, and compare it with the events which have happened and those which are impending. Read the second paragraph of page 3 of the first volume of the *Record* of the Fifty-third Congress, in which the inaugural is published, and note the severe measure which was to be meted out to the "immense aggregations of kindred enterprises and combinations of business interests," which was the President's condensation of the word "trusts," and compare the hope with the fruition as shown in the Senate debate and the Senate vote of June 5th on the sugar schedule. Compare the homily on "paternalism" and the duty of having our "judgments unmoved by alluring phrases and unvexed by selfish interests," with the Jones amendments to the Tariff bill and the unerring certainty with which you can pick out the utterly unselfish interests which prompted their introduction and the particular senators who have laid their selfish interests a sacrifice on the altar of their Democracy.

The inaugural also attracts attention, upon rereading, by another phrase:

"When we tear aside," says the President, "the delusions and misconceptions which have blinded our countrymen to their condition under vicious tariff laws, we but show them how far they have been led away from the paths of contentment and prosperity." This was said March 4, 1893, when all mill wheels

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were turning, factories were humming, trains were loaded, and the laborer was receiving the largest hire that labor ever knew on earth since Adam left Eden. Mr. Cleveland's administration and friends have certainly "torn aside" a good many "delusions and misconceptions," but, "blinded as our countrymen were to their condition under vicious tariff laws," they never mistook the Slough of Despond for the "paths of contentment and prosperity."

Another part of the inaugural contains some very fitting words in regard to the spoils system, intimating that offices should not be the rewards of partisan activity. Of course this also means that offices should not be used as rewards for legislative action, and we are all quite sure that the two letters of Senator Vest, recently published, which intimate that conformity to the President's views on matters of legislation is the indispensable prerequisite to the reception of a senator's "advice" as to offices in his own State, were erroneous as to fact or mistakes in discernment. We are quite sure also that the advice of Boston Democratic newspapers to use offices for purposes of legislation was never followed.

This REVIEW has not pages enough to contrast the inaugural, which was promise, with the facts, which are fulfillment.

We have very little to do with foreign nations, and there is nothing which troubles us less than our foreign affairs. Judging from what has happened in the little sphere in which we do move, it is lucky for us that rolling oceans, for the most part, divide us from the rest of the world.

If foreign affairs meant for us peace and war, trade and commerce, life and death, this country would have been in as bad a collapse of distrust as to diplomacy as it is as to business. Of course I have not the slightest design to rehearse the Hawaiian affair which excited so much just indignation, but has latterly fallen so dead that the country hardly noticed the other day the fact that the Senate in no ambiguous phrase reëchoed the demand of the country that the people of those islands should be let alone, and thereby administered to the administration that rebuke which would have been so much more valuable if it had been more prompt. It took the present Senate more than a year to come to the conclusion which the country reached on sight. The House, with Governor McCreary chairman of foreign affairs, is still sup-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

porting the President. But the House is Democratic by one hundred majority, the Senate by only three. I commented some time ago in this REVIEW on the violation by the Wilson Bill of the principles laid down by the Democracy in convention assembled and made part of the platform which conducted their partisans to power. That lead has been followed throughout, and to-day almost all the other planks of that platform are swimming separate in the vast gulf of human misery which their promises mock, kept not even to the ear.

Washington, the State, is mourning over the swarm of Georgians newly imported into the offices there to show that home rule in a platform and home rule in practice do not go hand in hand, while Washington, the city, sees one of the best places placating a Kansas man who would take nothing else.

Last month, two days after the Oregon election, another distinctive plank was ripped off and flung into the stormy sea. Of course this is the best that could be done with it as with all the rest, but the event shows of how little value are all the declarations of a party which has no real union of principle and purpose. Nevertheless the defeat of a measure which had the deliberate sanction of the party in convention assembled, by a vote of 172 to 102 in a House where the strict party majority is eighty, and the real majority is one hundred, was an event significant of the untrustworthiness of those who did it. The way also in which the bill, which was made the vehicle to bring before the House the repeal of the State bank tax, was kicked into the waste basket afterwards, had in it a befitting touch of the ludicrous; so also had the fact that eight Democrats who two years ago before the convention met voted for repeal, turned round after it became a party pledge and voted against it. The House discussed the question a week and a half, and then the whole thing—bill, amendment, substitute, and all—disappeared, leaving not a wrack behind.

But all these things are small matters hardly worth the time already spent on them. The great crime of the present administration of affairs has been its treatment of the tariff question. The treatment commenced in the Democratic platform, with its wild denunciation of protection and fanatical indorsement of free trade. Had the people of this country taken the tirade seriously there would have been no trouble. Had anybody believed the Democratic party to be in earnest it would not have lived through

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

half the election day. But everybody thought it only a political manœuvre, a last desperate attempt to beat Mr. Cleveland, and all but a few believed that the rejected plank, which had some sense in it, would be found to embody the real determination of the party when it went really into action. The protectionists in the Democratic party did not dream what a powerful weapon they were putting into the hands of their enemies, or how powerful the South was and how much the organization there was wedded to free trade, and how little the representatives from that section would listen to the established industries of the country. The old Southern Bourbons have been the bane of the Democratic party time out of mind. Naturally attaching themselves to it because it is farthest in the rear, they drag it backward, and, whenever it is in power, the nation with it. In the present House, organized with a Southern man of that stamp in the chair, the Committee of Ways and Means was so composed that Northern industrial sentiment had little influence, so little that the only representative of Northern manufactures allowed on the list refused to vote for the results of their labors.

It is too late to discuss the bill which they presented to the House. The country has discussed it fully and has made up its opinion thereon. So bad was it, even from the Democratic standpoint, that the Senate Finance Committee, even with all the changes they could make themselves, were compelled, as soon as the result of their lucubrations saw the light of day, to propose more than four hundred changes before the most brisk traffic that the history of legislation ever saw could make it possible to secure its passage, and even that has not been enough, for more than one day has witnessed the adoption of amendments the sole purpose of which was to obtain votes by the use of those "alluring phrases" and "selfish interests" which the inaugural so feelingly deprecated. The lovely programme of "free raw material," an "alluring phrase" which was to captivate New England, has given place to those "selfish interests" of senators who demanded "taxed" coal and "taxed" iron ore, while the farmers' wool was despised both as a source of revenue and as a proper subject for protection.

Perhaps the most surprising exhibition of all has been the conduct of the Senate on the sugar question. The protection of sugar refining might be justifiable, and was justifiable on the prin-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ciple that so great an article of consumption should be brought to the market by American labor, and that in this, as in all other products, this nation should do its own work and preserve its own market for its own people. So also a people who desired to produce the raw material of an article which has become such a necessity of modern civilized life as sugar has, might well bestow the public money in the form of bounties to establish an industry at once profitable and indispensable. Those who contended for protection as a principle of national growth in wealth and power, could well afford to sustain all reasonable efforts to make us independent of foreign producers. But that those who denounce all protection as robbery, who proclaim it on all occasions and in every instance to be class legislation, could by a solid party vote not only tax the people perhaps for all time for the benefit of a portion of a single State, but give these *protégés* a year's bounty besides, passes all human understanding; when you add to that the fact that the greater part of that portion of the tax which falls to the refiners will inure to the benefit of one of those "immense aggregations of kindred enterprises and combinations of business interests formed for the purpose of limiting production and fixing prices," which were so denounced in the inaugural, the performance, if it receives the Presidential sanction, will pass all human language. Without trenching for a moment on the province of the investigating committee of the Senate now at work, it will not be unjust to say that all this, so utterly inconsistent with all former and all present professions, was done because some senators representing their constituents were not in the least moved by the "alluring phrases" of the Democratic platform, but laid hard hold upon those "selfish interests" with which the President thought we would be "unvexed."

The sugar clauses were not for revenue only. They had a commercial value, when translated into votes, which could not be resisted. I do not refer to any scandal or make any insinuation of that nature. The only reference is to the use of those log-rolling means from which tariff reform was to free us. The revenue was not needed, for the income tax was always claimed to be ample to supply the deficit, and if the friends of the bill are to be believed we tax the people of this country, and create a surplus, not to supply its needs, but to obtain votes by appeals to selfish interests and those entirely local. Is not this something which recalls the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

words "culminating atrocity of class legislation"? How unfortunate it is for a party to have gone into action with so large and interesting a vocabulary—"culminating atrocity of class legislation," "fraud," "robbery," "paternalism," "selfish interests." How queer they look now, those children of the swiftly vibrating tongue as they lie side by side in their last resting-places. They were lovely in their lives, and in their death they were not divided.

The limits of this article preclude any full discussion of the action of the Senate, and such a discussion in the liveliest hands would be wearisome. Hence one can only touch upon the points most salient, the points which have special significance. Nothing shows better than the cotton schedule the care which the Southern men have for their own industries. "Ad valorem" does not predominate there, and yet cottons are sostable in their character that they need specifics as little as any thing on the list. Contrast this treatment with that which woollens receive, and you will realize that while sectionalism may be rebuked in words it may reign triumphant in deeds. There, among woollens, where specifics are most demanded by practical men, where undervaluations are the most dangerous, "ad valorems" lead the way to fraud and the destruction of industries. If those two schedules should ever become law, watch the effect, and then see that sectionalism never again gets into our laws. We in the North are anxious that the South should be prosperous. We are thus anxious for a sounder reason than sentimentalism, we do not say it as an alluring phrase, but are incited by wisely selfish interests which are incentives to human progress. We wish the South prosperous, so that the South may think as we do and senseless bickerings may cease. And it is just as easy to bring the South to our industrial level as it is to lower us to theirs, and far more profitable to this nation. We do not therefore sorrow over anything the South may get in the proposed tariff bill, but rather rejoice. We could still more rejoice if all other industries all over the country were as well treated as cotton in the coarser grades. Cotton also in the finer work could bear the better treatment which we shall some day give it, to the great benefit of both North and South.

We do not complain that Southern rice is protected, but we cannot see just at what point of southern latitude the robbery involved in protection to agricultural products melts off and is ab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sorbed in what seems to be a universal solvent, the tariff for revenue only, which renders it both pure and peaceable.

Of the effects which this choice of Democracy for the government of the country has had upon wages and labor I shall not speak. Not one single word is needed. Those whom this aspect of the question concerns know better what it means than any human being can tell them. I only pause to note that that problem of lowering wages to meet prices, which seemed to free traders prating about "lower prices to consumers" so easy to solve a half-year ago, does not grow any less difficult of solution as the days go by.

Who is responsible for all this and the hundred more things which might have been described? Some of those gentlemen who helped to create the great fame which the president had in his former adminstration charge it upon him and declare that he, single handed and alone, could have prevented all these disasters and created that ideal republic which four years ago came out of the horn gate of dreams and clothed itself in his language and theirs. How unkind and unjust all this is. Why cannot these men see, for they assisted, that all that the president created four years ago was created not with stone and iron and mortar, but with the pencil and the ruler. A loftier pyramid than either of the three that stand majestic on Egyptian sands can tower on the smallest piece of white paper. But real pyramids mean stone and struggle and sweat of men. They mean not only the king, but Egyptians swarming to do the work. The work these modern Egyptians are swarming to do is not the building of eternal pyramids, but the strewing of the shifting sands which lie at their feet.

How long will it be before the children of this Republic rise to the full knowledge of their faith and rest on the foundation-stone of their institutions, that no one man can make or mar, but that all the people finally come, and are the only Daniel that does finally come, to judgment.

It is true that the last year demonstrates how careless the judgment of our Daniel may sometimes be, and how great are the costs and charges of his court, but there is always an appeal, and to-day neither suitor doubts what the next judgment is to be.

THOMAS B. REED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROBLEMS AND PERILS OF BRITISH POLITICS.

BY GOLDWIN SMITH, D. C. L., LL. D.

THE present crisis in England has a special interest for Americans, as it has led in an unexpected way to a practical comparison of political experience between the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race, and made English statesmen for the first time turn their eyes to American institutions. The attempts which have been made to defend the concession of a separate parliament to Ireland by an appeal to the success of the federal system in the United States are obviously unavailing. The position of an American State in the Union, in which all the States have the same measure of local self-government and the same share in the government of the confederation, affords no precedent for the proposal to confer semi-independence on one portion of the United Kingdom. That such a notion should have been for a moment entertained only shows how ignorant of each other the two Anglo-Saxon communities have hitherto been. Instead of being an example of the successful application of home rule, in the Irish sense, the United States are a tremendous example of civil war brought on by the separatism of State-right; while the practical prevalence of the national over the federal tendency has of late been a leading feature of American history. But what is at once surprising and important is the recourse of British Conservatives in quest of safeguards against revolutionary violence to the conservative elements of the American Constitution. Hitherto the American Republic has been the bugbear of the English Conservative, as was seen with disastrous effect in the sympathy shown by that party for the seceding South. Now British Conservatives are looking with wistful eyes to the American Senate, to the President's veto, to the Supreme Court, to the clause of the Constitution forbidding

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislation against the faith of contracts, and generally to the security against revolutionary change which the written Constitution affords.

Republican America is in fact more conservative than monarchical and aristocratic England. The reason is plain. The framers of the American Constitution looked democracy in the face. They did their best to organize it and to provide it with safeguards, though, being only wise men, not inspired prophets, they failed to foresee all the dangers, notably the danger of party, which Washington evidently regarded as an accidental and transient evil. But England has never looked democracy in the face, never attempted to organize it, or provided it with safeguards. English statesmen and Englishmen generally have floated on in the belief that, having sufficient safeguards in their hereditary monarchy and their aristocratic Upper House, they could afford to make the House of Commons as popular and democratic as they pleased. Meantime the House of Commons, thanks to its sole command of the purse and to the general triumph of democracy, has been becoming supreme, and has drawn to itself, not only the legislative power, but the virtual appointment of the executive. The monarchy has practically ceased to exist as a political force and dwindled to a social apex. Its legislative veto has not been exercised in any important case since William III. vetoed the Triennial Act, and its last exercise of authority in the appointment of the executive was the dismissal of the Whig Ministry by William IV. Nobody thinks it strange that in the midst of this dangerous crisis monarchy should be disporting itself in the pleasure haunts of Italy. The House of Lords has practically ceased to be, what in theory it is, a coördinate branch of the legislature in everything save the initiation of money bills. It now claims nothing more than a suspensive veto, the exercise of which is fiercely challenged by the democracy and met with threats of ending the House itself. The House of Commons, meanwhile, through successive extensions of the franchise, in which the two political parties have been bidding against each other, has been growing more and more democratic. The process is still going on. A new registration bill has been brought in by the Radical Government to give full effect to the ascendancy of numbers, strip property of its only remaining advantage, and thus snap the last link between representation and taxation. Payment

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of members is apparently coming, and when it comes it will level about the only bulwark of a practical kind which conservatism retains. Already the majority of the House of Commons is not only radical, but revolutionary, and is doing the will of the wage-earning class, which, having got political power into its hands, is inclined to use it for the purpose of industrial and social change. Recent legislation by the House of Commons has been distinctly socialistic. The Eight-Hours Bill is an interference with the freedom of adult male labor, and with the contract between the adult male laborer and his employer. The Employers' Liability Bill also involved an abrogation of liberty of contract. The next measure, it seems, is to be a grant out of the taxes for pensions to aged laborers, which, by the avowal of its promoters, will be likely to entail an expense of a hundred millions of dollars a year—a different thing, be it observed, from a grant of army pensions, or any pensions, for a specific purpose; though all pension lists alike are liable to abuse when the pension agent gets to work. The party from which these measures emanate retains the name of Liberal; but in truth it is no longer Liberal, it is Socialistic. The only Liberals, in the old sense of the term, now remaining in England are the Hartingtonians, whose sentiments are practically identical with those of an American statesman.

The danger of a revolutionary change is enhanced in the case of Great Britain, by her being the centre of a world-wide empire. If a demagogic and revolutionary assembly, the creature of trade-unions and the Clan-na-Gael, could not be trusted with the destinies of its own community, much less could it be trusted with the destinies of colonies and dependencies scattered over the globe. The British rulers of India, with its subject population of two hundred and eighty millions, and with all its difficulties and perils, may well tremble at the thought.

To end the upper chamber or to strip it of all authority by leaving it a nominal existence, and thus to make the House of Commons the sole as well as the supreme power in the state, is the aim of the revolutionary party. To mend the upper chamber, make it again a co-ordinate branch of the legislature, like the American Senate, a real restraint on the excesses of a popular House, and a substantial barrier against revolution, is the aim of enlightened Conservatives. This is the great issue of the hour. Enlightened Conservatives see that this cannot be done without

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

divesting the House wholly or in part of its hereditary character; that the hereditary principle, whatever may have been its function in an earlier stage of civilization, has done its work and had its day; that while in the Middle Ages the lord had arduous duties, military, administrative, and judicial, to perform, and was thus saved from sybaritism, sybaritism is the inevitable tendency of the modern man of wealth and hereditary rank; that the record of the House of Lords during the last two centuries will not bear examination, being simply the record of the resistance of a privileged order, and of the landed interest which that order represented, to all change, even to reform of the criminal law, the improvement of security for personal liberty, the abolition of slavery, the emancipation of the press. But what shall take the place of the hereditary principle, and on what line the House shall be reorganized, are problems not easy of solution. No constituencies for the election of a Senate present themselves like the States in the American Constitution. The mere injection of a certain number of life peers would by no means meet the exigencies of the case, and would in itself be an unpromising expedient, since the hereditary and life sections could scarcely fuse, and as often as the life members were outvoted by those whose only title to a share in legislation was their being "the sons of their fathers," popular clamor and a cry for the abolition of the hereditary element would ensue.

The idea of a nominative senate is condemned, not only by its unpopular character and the weakness which its want of popular basis would entail, but by decisive experience in the colonies, notably in Canada, where the nominative senate is a hopeless failure and the nominations are little better than an addition to the fund of corruption in the hands of a party government. A basis of the elective kind, as nearly equivalent to the States of the Union as Great Britain affords, seems to be supplied by the County Councils, newly instituted in place of the Quarter Sessions, composed of county magnates acting as justices of the peace; by which the rural administration has hitherto been carried on, together with the councils of cities. To a House elected by these bodies it has been proposed to add a certain number of members appointed for special qualifications, such as having held high office or command, national or imperial, being the head of professions, or having done eminent service to the state. Such a house

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might, it is thought, command rational allegiance and form a rallying point for reasonable resistance to revolution. It would not be likely to be reactionary, or to do more than give the deliberate opinion of the nation the ascendant over demagogic violence and gusts of popular passion. The bi-cameral system, compose your chambers as you will, has its inherent disadvantages: it is liable to deadlock, to the withdrawal of guidance and control from the popular chamber, and to the weakening of its sense of responsibility; but the system is too deeply seated in England to be changed, especially when the nation is crossing a dangerous ford.

Supposing a scheme to be framed, the difficulty of getting it adopted is still great. There is a section of the House of Lords, unfortunately including the leader, which clings to hereditary privilege and will do all it can, openly or furtively, to stave off reform, a course in which it will be encouraged by the parting ray of popularity which has shone upon the House of Lords since their preservation of national unity by the rejection of Home Rule. These Tory opponents of reform have powerful though unnatural allies in the revolutionists of the House of Commons, who desire nothing so little as a reconstruction of the upper chamber, which would make it an effective curb, and who would easily find pretexts for wrecking the measure in its passage through their own House. It has been suggested that the House of Lords, were it so minded, might turn the flank of the resistance in the House of Commons by a resolution of self-reform, limiting the practice of sitting and voting to a select body of its members, while all would preserve their eligibility to the select body as well as their titles and their social rank. The House some time ago divested itself, by a formal resolution, of the invidious privilege of voting by proxy, while the lay members informally renounced their power of voting on legal appeals. This plan, however, would call for a good deal of self-sacrifice in a quarter where much self-sacrifice is not commonly found.

On the other hand the Radicals have no means of abolishing the House of Lords or docking it of its powers without its own consent, otherwise than by revolution. To constrain the Crown to swamp by new creations a majority of hundreds would be revolutionary, and, if it came to that, the next thing would be civil war.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The reorganization of the Upper House of Parliament at all events is the vital question of the hour. Upon its solution, not only the escape of the country from revolution, but the preservation of its unity depends. Since the surrender of the House of Commons to Irish disunion the House of Lords has become the guardian, not only of the Conservative institutions, but of the integrity of the nation.

It is not only the decadence of the hereditary principle that enforces a change in the constitution of the House of Lords. The power of the British aristocracy has rested not so much on the pedigrees, which in truth do not go back to the Norman conquest, as on the entailed estates. By an aristocracy and gentry of entailed estates England was in fact ruled entirely till 1832, when the Reform Bill admitted the commercial element to a share of power, and continued to be largely ruled down to the recent extension of the suffrage. But the rents of the entailed estates have now been fearfully reduced, and in some cases almost annihilated, by the fall in the price of wheat, which seems likely to continue, for the Argentine is now exporting, in addition to Russia, America, and Hindustan; while the wheat-growing area of Hindustan seems capable of indefinite extension and of being rendered more productive by construction of railways and improvement of implements, Hindu labor being at the same time extremely cheap. It seems hardly possible that the land in England should continue to maintain squire, farmer, and farm laborer. Many of the estates are moreover burdened with mortgages and with rent charges in favor of widows and younger children, which remain fixed while the rents decline. Mansions are being everywhere let by their impoverished owners, who retire to economize elsewhere, and in the palace of a noble family in Piccadilly dwells an American millionaire. Economical revolution, as usual, draws political and social revolution in its train. The weakness of a peerage without rents will soon be seen. The accidental coincidence of this economical catastrophe with the political and social crisis is a singular and momentous feature of the situation. The political enemies of the landed gentry of course grasp the opportunity of hastening and completing its fall. The new Parish Councils are the engines by means of which they hope, as they say, to disestablish the squire. They are using the taxing power for the same end. What rural England will be when the manorial and large-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farm system which forms its present organization is abolished Radicals, provided the political revolution is effected, are not very anxious to inquire.

Home Rule, as a popular movement, is almost dead. As a popular movement, indeed, apart from the agrarian agitation, it never had in it much life. What the Irish people wanted was, not political change, but the land. It was because they were persuaded that an Irish Parliament would give them the land that they shouted for the political change. Having got the land they care little for political change, and they could scarcely be lashed into showing the slightest resentment when the Home Rule Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords. They have contributed but sparingly to the Home Rule fund, while the hat has been sent round among their friends in the United States; a symptom which is the more significant, as they are very generous by nature and usually give freely to any object near their hearts. All the agitations in Ireland for the repeal of the union, when not combined with agrarianism, have been utterly weak, O'Connell's agitation not less than the rest. But there are still the eighty Irish Nationalist members in the House of Commons bent on having a parliament, government, treasury, and patronage of their own, and these have the fate of the ministry in their hands. Nor is disunionism, or what the Germans would call "particularism," now confined to the case of Ireland. To get his Irish measure carried, its author appealed to provincial jealousies and antipathies all round, Scotch and Welsh as well as Irish. The spirits came at his call, and while other countries, formerly disunited, such as Germany and Italy, are now united, or moving in the direction of union, while in America herself nationality has been prevailing over federalism, Great Britain is suddenly threatened with dissolution into her primal elements. It is one thing to devolve the business of an overloaded parliament on local councils; it is another to split up the realm into its original nationalities and undo the work of statesmen who have been laboring for ages to form a united nation. The first may be a necessary measure; though the main reason why Parliament is overloaded is that it wastes its time in faction-fighting instead of doing its business. The second is manifest ruin. Yet to the dismemberment of the nation the madness of party is ready to resort, if it can win the game by no other means. Let other nations which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have given themselves over to the rule of party profit by the example.

All dangerous questions seem to have been brought to a head at once by the storm which the framer of the Irish Bill raised to put wind into the flapping sails of his Irish barque. The next fight, apparently, will be about the disestablishment of the Church in Wales, which Mr. Gladstone promised the Welsh on condition of their supporting his Irish policy. The author of "The Church in Its Relation to the State" may perhaps be congratulated on not having remained in office to face his former self upon this issue. Inured as he must be by this time to charges of inconsistency, and preternaturally gifted as he is with the faculty of explanation, his position would hardly have been pleasant, especially as he would have been brought into direct collision with all his High-Church friends, who, while they cared comparatively little for the established Church of Ireland, a strongly Protestant communion, will fight desperately for the established Church of Wales, in the fate of which they believe that of the whole English establishment to be involved. The established Church of Wales must go, though it is hardly, as some American journalists seem to think, worse than the Inquisition, the extermination of the Albigenses, or the massacre of St. Bartholomew. The established Church of Wales must go, and in time the established churches of England and Scotland will follow. Yet one could wish that so great a change as this must be in the spiritual organization and life of a nation could be made by hands more tender and reverential than those of infuriated politicians, and through some process calmer than a faction fight.

England of course shares the general unrest of the world. She shares the decay of the religious beliefs by which the social frame has hitherto been largely sustained and the perturbation which follows. She shares the failure of trust in a future life as the scene of compensation for poverty and suffering in this life, which has hitherto reconciled the less fortunate to their present lot. She shares the discontent which, when religion ceases to breathe contentment, is inevitably one of the first effects of popular education. She shares the prevalence, in the dim twilight of popular knowledge, of social chimeras and reveries of all kinds. She shares the unhappy effects of the sharp line of division between the employer and the wage-earner with the industrial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conflicts to which it gives rise. She shares the danger arising from the eagerness of the masses to use the political power of which they have become possessed for the purpose of transferring the property of the wealthier classes to themselves. Of the industrial disturbances and perils she has a particularly large share, owing to the great numbers of her wage-earners, the large proportion which her factory-hands, mechanics, and miners bear to her general population, their collection in inflammable masses, and their singular lack of national feeling; while the sensitiveness of her vast commercial system, partly made up of industries which are rather artificial and factitious than growths of her own soil, exposes her to catastrophes of no ordinary kind.

There is a general complaint of the deterioration of British statesmanship. One is always inclined to mistrust laudations of the past at the expense of the present, but it can hardly be doubted that in dignity at all events there has been a decline since the days of Pitt, Canning, and Peel. Extension of suffrage has brought with it the stump. Nor was it possible that statesmanship could escape the effects of a vast extension of the franchise, or the need of demagogic arts. This may be merely a stage in the political education of the people, as all the disturbances and perils of the time may be incidents of a period of fermentation from which the stream will one day run calm and clear. But at present it is difficult for any independent, lofty, and commanding figure to appear in the political field. Cavour and Bismarck were not the offspring of the caucus or the platform, but of high national endeavor and of the hour which would have the man.

Let evolution and the philosophy of history say what they will, much depends, especially at the great turning points, on personal action. If Mirabeau had not died, or Napoleon had died, events would have taken a widely different course. In England at this moment amidst all the confusion, uncertainty, and irresolution, with the gulf of revolution beginning to yawn, the appearance of anything like a commanding figure, especially one that rose above party, might turn the wavering scale. There are some men of high mark, but there can hardly be said to be a commanding figure on the scene.

Lord Salisbury owes the Conservative leadership in part to historic rank and princely wealth, but mainly to ability and character. He is a powerful though not a finished nor always,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is commonly thought, an adroit or discreet speaker. Diplomacy is his line; he prefers it, as aristocratic statesmen often do, to domestic politics. Of domestic politics he has not made a serious study, nor is there anything to show that he grasps and is prepared to deal with the situation. His leisure is understood to be spent, not in working out political problems, but in chemistry, in which he is an adept. In regard to home politics he shows something of aristocratic indolence and nonchalance; nor can desperate effort or the readiness to run risks for which a great crisis may call be naturally expected of a grandee. In 1886 Lord Salisbury, raised to power at a most critical juncture, with a majority of a hundred in the House of Commons, instead of grappling with the question of the hour and trying to redress the balance of the constitution, retired into the Foreign Office and allowed the fruits of Unionist victory to be lost. His one fixed aim appears to be the retention of an hereditary House of Lords, not that he is actuated by any narrow or selfish spirit of caste, but he regards hereditary aristocracy as the heaven-appointed antidote to democratic excess and baseness. He even goes so far in his efforts to stave off reform from the House of Lords as to appeal to the jealousy of the revolutionary party in the House of Commons. He also clings to Church establishment, to which his allies, the Liberal-Unionists, do not cling, though they wish the question to be treated with tenderness and moderation. It is unfortunate that, being set to stem revolution in the interest of gradual and rational progress, he happens to concentrate upon himself all the popular feeling against caste. He is, moreover, in the wrong House. The Conservative party is proud, and has reason to be proud, of its leader; but fatal experience seems to have shown that it is not skilfully led.

In Mr. Balfour there is a union of practical vigor and courage with sensibility and culture, which never fails to interest, and which has impressed not only American lookers-on, but the people of Ireland, by whom, when he visited their island, the Unionist secretary was remarkably well received. In debate he is very prompt and effective, and no fault has been found with his leadership of the opposition. Why he is not exactly a commanding figure, or more generally regarded as the destined deliverer of the country from its perils, it is difficult to say. Perhaps he is rather too much of a tactician. His opposition to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Home Rule Bill was distinctly tactical. It failed to make a broad impression on the national mind, such as would have been made by a great national statesman of the old school, and all the tactical skill was not crowned with a single victory in Committee. Strategy based on the hope of divisions in the enemy's camp is always weak ; sections may quarrel among themselves, but, at the decisive point, they all prefer the frying-pan to the fire. Mr. Balfour shows a weak spot when, to capture votes, he flirts with bimetallism and woman suffrage.

The Duke of Devonshire, better known by his former title of Lord Hartington, was in his youth regarded as a lounger and a man of pleasure. He was in public life as the heir of a great Whig house, but was supposed to consider it a bore. Comic stories embodying that belief were current. His high rank and vast wealth left scarcely an object to which his ambition could aspire. If in 1875, when Mr. Gladstone for a moment threw up the cards, he was made provisional leader of the opposition in Mr. Gladstone's place, it was mainly because he could with more grace than one of the older men give way to the real leader when it pleased the real leader to return. But when the unity of the nation was in peril by the secession of Mr. Gladstone to Home Rule, Lord Hartington nobly responded to the call of duty. And he has ever since lived laborious days, days which must be doubly laborious to an unambitious and pleasure-loving man. As a speaker he is content to talk good sense, without pretence to eloquence, though with dignity and effect. The confidence which his character inspires is perhaps the nearest thing to a hold upon the entire nation possessed by any of the leaders. Like Lord Salisbury he is now in the wrong House, though his presence in it adds to its strength at a critical juncture.

Nothing in these events is more striking than the force shown by Mr. Chamberlain in holding Birmingham, with all its democracy, fast to the Union cause. His speeches of late, both in Parliament and out of it, have been most effective. He is unquestionably a man of real mark and must play a leading part in whatever is to come. To call him a turncoat and a wandering rhetorician, as Lord Rosebery does, would be absurd. The ground of quarrel between him and Lord Rosebery's party is that on the great question of the day he refused to turn his coat. It is true

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that some of the socialistic utterances of his early days, however, still embarrass him. It is true also that he has been regarded rather as a municipal than a national politician. On the other hand, he is free from the indolence, the timidity, and the formal embarrassments of the grandee. He could dare and risk something for the country.

That social feeling still goes for something is apparent when a party which is shouting for the abolition of the House of Lords finds itself constrained to accept as its leader a lord who has never been in the House of Commons, and who has less of a record than any prime minister since the beginning of this century. Mr. Gladstone himself, on whose recommendation his successor was chosen, has, amidst all his political developments, preserved his feeling of traditional reverence for the aristocracy and the Court. A greater contrast there could hardly be between two leaders of the same party than that between Mr. Gladstone and his successor, the first appealing to the religious public by defences of Mosaic cosmogony, the second appealing to the sporting public as the winner of the Derby. Lowell used to say of Mr. Gladstone that he had a unique power of improvising lifelong convictions ; his convictions, however, when improvised, were intense. His successor seldom speaks without confirming the general belief that he is a politician of the sporting order, and is running for the political Derby. He may be said almost to avow himself an Opportunist. He tells you that he sees nothing wrong in the established Church, and that he is ready on demand to pull it down ; that he is a second-chamber man, and ready on demand to abolish or reduce to impotence the house of Lords ; that he considers the consent of England indispensable to the alteration of the compact of union, and that he is ready, if he can get a large majority, to alter it without her consent. One day he is visibly angling for the support of the Liberal-Unionists. Finding they do not bite, he next day makes a thorough-going Home Rule speech. Mr. Gladstone has always been opposed to aggrandisement and to military expenditure. Lord Rosebery owes his popularity largely to his reputation for Imperialism, with which he combines a pledge to dismember the nation which is the heart of the Empire. Lord Rosebery's opponents all acknowledge his great address, his singular charm of manner, his unfailing readiness and liveliness of speech. His comparative youth, for he is only

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forty-five, invests him with a certain glamour, and his eminence on the turf, while it helps him with the sporting class, is not likely to do him much harm with the Non-Conformist conscience, now more political than religious. He has the very considerable advantage of a perfectly open choice among all the principles, policies, and courses which may seem conducive to the maintenance of his party in power. The only cloud on his horizon is the probability that a point will be reached at which the grand seigneur and the social radical will part.

So rapidly is the scene shifting that forecast is hardly possible, even for those upon the spot. To attempt to define the situation is like shooting at a running deer. The strategy of the government, which it calls statesmanship, is directed to two objects: the invention of a profitable quarrel with the House of Lords, and the dissolution of the alliance between the Conservative and Liberal wings of the Unionist party. To attain the first object measures are brought in, such as the Employers' Liability Bill and the Eight-Hours Bill, which the Lords are likely to reject, and the rejection of which may embroil them with the trade-unions. For the attainment of the second object Home Rule, which unites the two wings of the Unionist party, is kept in the background, as far as the necessity of retaining Irish support will permit, and questions which divide the Unionists, such as Welsh Disestablishment, are brought to the front. After all, the event will very likely be decided, not by any one of the great issues, much less by a general judgment on national policy as a whole, which far transcends the mental power of the masses, but by the last thing which has happened before the election, if it is of a kind to interest or stir the people. It is believed that on the last occasion some of the metropolitan elections were turned by popular indignation at the arrest of a respectable woman as a street-walker, through a mistake of the police. "Go, my, son and see with how little wisdom the world is governed." The well-known words of Oxenstierna are hardly less applicable to popular than to royal government.

If any American is enough of an Anglophobist to wish to see misfortune befall the cradle of his race, it is not unlikely that his wish may be fulfilled. Still there is force in old England, if the man can be found to call it forth.

GOLDWIN SMITH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE POSTAL SERVICE AT NEW YORK.

BY THE HON. CHARLES W. DAYTON, POSTMASTER AT NEW YORK.

"NEARLY all the mails to and from the other nations of the world are despatched from or received at the New York office.—*Report of Postmaster-General Bissell for* 1893.

The chief end of a postal service is the most rapid and unerring delivery of mail matter. The postal system which secures that result is the best, and to the best postal service the people of the United States and all civilized peoples holding communication with our country are entitled.

The cost of the postal service in the United States is far in excess of the receipts for postage—the reports of the Postmasters General showing, with monotonous regularity year after year, a large deficit. The main cause of this undesirable financial condition is to be found in the heavy outlay necessary to provide for the transportation of the mails, not only between the great business centres and throughout the more densely populated sections of the country, but to the remote and sparsely settled portions of our vast territory, in many cases over routes where the postage on the mail matter conveyed is but an inconsiderable fraction of the sum paid the contractors for its conveyance. Of a total expenditure of $81,000,000 in 1893 for all postal purposes, nearly $41,500,000 was paid for mail transportation and items incident thereto. The contrast between Great Britain, whose postal surplus is over $14,000,000, and the United States, with its deficit of over $5,000,000, is readily accounted for by the fact that while both countries have the same rate of inland letter postage, the transportation service of the former covers only 121,112 square miles, while that of the latter extends over 3,594,000.

This annual shortage in our postal accounts, however, is an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

unavoidable incident to our position as a growing and yet "unfinished" country, and to seek a remedy through an increase of letter postage would in my judgment be most unwise and impolitic. The benefits resulting from an efficient system of mail transportation to every portion of our land are too important to be ignored or restricted because the pecuniary returns derived from that service fall below its cost. Its maintenance is a public necessity, and I believe the people, whose welfare in all directions is so largely dependent on its efficiency, are quite willing to provide the necessary funds. But as the cost of mail transportation is the primary cause of the deficit, and while the postal revenues mainly accrue at the larger post offices and throughout the older and more thickly populated States, and while the service on unremunerative post routes is mainly of benefit to the residents of the newer States and Territories, it would certainly seem unfair and illogical that appropriations necessary to improve and extend the postal facilities in the larger cities should be refused or opposed by the representatives of those rural constituencies who enjoy the advantages which others are taxed to provide—especially as improved and extended facilities at the large offices involves improvement and extension everywhere.

There are in London eight "District Post Offices," each in charge of a Postmaster. Within the delivery district of each of these offices there are from 40 to 173 branch and sub-post offices, the aggregate number of which is 795—making a total of 803 offices, at all of which stamps may be purchased, and letters and parcels posted, and at nearly all of which money orders are issued and paid, letters may be registered, and Life Insurance Annuity and Savings Bank business may be transacted. At all the larger sub-offices there is also telegraph service. The population of London in 1891 was 4,231,431—so that there is in that city a post office to every 5,268 inhabitants. The number of officers and subordinates regularly employed in the London local postal service is 10,896, of whom 5,886 are letter-carriers, in addition to a large "auxiliary" force, available for extra duty whenever required. The amount paid the latter is equivalent to that necessary for the constant employment of 1,000 additional men—so that the actual force is very nearly 11,000.

In New York there are: 1 General Post Office, 18 Branch

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Post Office-Stations, and 24 Sub-stations, at all of which, in addition to ordinary postal business, money orders may be procured and paid and letters registered. The resident population of New York, as shown by last municipal census, is 1,801,739—and on that basis there is allowed one post office to each 41,900 of its people. But during the business hours of each secular day the population is increased by the influx of a large proportion of the adult male residents of Brooklyn, Jersey City, and numerous other cities, towns, and villages located within a radius of 50 miles, all of whom receive and post their business correspondence at New York; and considering this fact, it is entirely safe to estimate that the proportion of post offices to population in New York is as 1 to 50,000. The number of officers and employees of all grades is 2,873.

This contrast between the postal facilities enjoyed by the residents of the chief city in Europe and those vouchsafed to residents of the chief city in the United States is not gratifying to our municipal or national pride; and one of the least agreeable incidents in the official life of a postmaster at New York is the receipt of written and oral comparisons, made by foreigners and travellers, between the service here and that provided in London and other European cities.

During the six months ending February 10th, 1894, there were received at the New York Post Office, in open transatlantic mails, 11,770,116 letters, of which 2,487,065 were addressed for delivery in this city; also 20,920 sacks of newspapers, printed matter, etc., 6,464 of which contained matter for distribution in this city. These figures do not include mail received from South America, West Indies, and overland from China, Japan, Australia, and Hawaii, nor mails received in sealed sacks to be forwarded, unopened, to Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and other large cities which exchange direct mails with Europe.

During the same period, the number of letters and postal cards made up in open and closed mails at the New York Post-office alone, was 14,800,966 in addition to printed matter. The total despatch consisted of 60,375 sacks.

The last published statistics of the International Bureau at Berne (which acts as a sort of general agency or clearing-house in all international postal affairs) shows that the number of pieces despatched in 1892 in mails from the United States to all other

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

countries of the Postal Union was 107,997,787. No report appears to have been made of the number received here; but from the proportion given in previous statements it may safely be estimated at not less than 100,000,000.

In 1853 the transatlantic mail service here was confined to four steamship lines, making 101 round trips; the number of letters carried during that year in both directions was 5,500,950. In 1893 this service was performed by twelve steamship lines, making 634 round trips and conveying about 65,000,000 letters and postal cards. Prior to 1854 the rates of postage on letters to Europe and beyond ranged from fifteen to fifty-nine cents per half ounce, and the cost of Transatlantic service in 1853 was $1,178,833, when five and one-half millions of letters were carried, while in 1893 a little over $500,000 was paid for that service in carrying over sixty-five millions of letters.

The First International Postal Conference grew out of the suggestion made in 1862 by Postmaster-General Montgomery Blair, resulting in the formation of the present "Universal Postal Union" and the establishment of a uniform rate of postage for letters at five cents per half ounce, and for printed matter, commercial papers, and merchandise samples, one cent per two ounces.

In 1859 Postmaster-General Holt, in his first annual report, said:

> "It is desirable that this department shall have the power to send forward the foreign mails as often as a safe, reliable vessel can be found to convey them, and that the obligation to prefer the American to the foreign steamships shall only exist when they sail on the same day."

This statesmanlike utterance did not fail in its effect; and in 1874 Postmaster-General Creswell arranged for the carriage of mails, without discrimination as to nationality or ownership, by the vessels which had shown by their records their ability to deliver mails at their destination in the shortest time.

The British office furnishes the Post Office Department at Washington with a weekly statement, showing the exact time of the arrivals of mail at the London Post Office, and the mails to be forwarded hence each month are assigned by our department to the vessels which, according to the record of their three immediately preceding eastward voyages, delivered the mail in the shortest time in London. The British Postal Administration has adhered to the contract system, which is liable to involve

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

delay to westward bound transatlantic mails, such as occurred when the "Bothnia" was given preference over the "Alaska," sailing on the same date, and landed several hundred sacks of British mail in New York a week after the arrival of the latter; and, as shown in more recent instances, where British mails, despatched from Liverpool by ships of contract lines on the same date at which fast vessels of the American line left Southampton, have not been received here until two and three days after the arrival of the latter at New York.

If the postal administrations of all countries despatching transatlantic mails could be induced or were compelled to select only the fastest ships using the most direct routes, without regard to considerations of national favor or of private or corporate interests, the "certainty, celerity, and security" of transatlantic mails would be greatly promoted.

The New York Post-Office is the exchange and banking office for the greater part of the postal money order business (domestic and international) of the country. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, there were 3,916,691 money order transactions, aggregating $113,763,698.77—being an increase of nearly 288,000 in the number of transactions and of over $4,000,000 in the aggregate amount thereof. It is the "Exchange Office" for the certification of money orders to twenty-three foreign countries, and also acts as the intermediary through which money orders issued in the United States may be paid in other foreign countries. The transactions incident to this portion of the money order business during last year aggregated over $18,000,000. The settlement of money order accounts with foreign countries is effected through this office, which during the same period purchased over $11,000,000 in European bills of exchange to be applied to that purpose.

The postmasters at over 900 money order offices in the United States remit their surplus funds by registered mail to the Postmaster at New York, who deposits the same daily in a depository designated by the Postmaster-General. From 130 to 135 such remittances are received daily, and their aggregate annual amount is nearly $35,000,000.

One fact in connection with the International money order system is of more than ordinary interest and suggestiveness—and that is the large excess of money-order remittances sent from this office to other countries over the amount received here from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

abroad. The total excess for 1893 was over $11,000,000, nearly $9,000,000 of which was transmitted to four foreign countries—Great Britain, Germany, Italy, and Sweden; and notwithstanding the general financial depression existing during that year, the amount sent to those countries exceeded by over $360,000 the sum transmitted during 1892.

During 1893, 1,152,431 registered letters and parcels were delivered, and 1,291,406 received for registration—the fees on which amounted to $103,312.48. The number of registered packages and pouches despatched was 1,724,254. New York is also the only "Exchange office" for all registered mails exchanged between the United States and transatlantic countries, and every letter and package included in those mails must be recorded here.

The value of registered packages of course cannot be accurately ascertained; but their daily inspection would convince the most casual observer that millions upon millions in bonds, stocks, currency, coin, jewels, etc., pass through the hands of the employees here every year. The clerks who have charge of the safe where packages of known money value are placed receive respectively salaries of only $700, $900, $1,100, and $1,400. The value of postage stamps cancelled on registered mail matter here amounts to about $172,000 per year. The pay-roll of this division and the salary list for registry clerks at the branch stations, aggregate about $150,000. In other words, the stamps cancelled upon registered articles originating in New York city pay for the clerical labor devoted to the entire registry business, and to all matter handled regardless of origin, foreign and domestic, including the enormous exchange office business to the rest of the world, the largest in existence, and the very large city delivery business, the largest in the world but one.

The cashier at the New York office is in charge of the sales of stamps, postal cards, stamped envelopes, etc., and each day each clerk in charge of stamps is obliged to balance his account in cash. The total value of stamps received for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, was $7,098,832.09, and the total sales $7,137,463.64—an increase of more than $750,000 over the sales in 1892.

There are at present nineteen branch stations in New York city, each one of which is a fully equipped Post Office. Station

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"P," situated at the Produce Exchange, did an aggregate business for the year ending June 30, 1893, of $351,559.08 for sales of stamps—94,372 in number of registered letters and articles, $331,632.67 in money orders, and is the largest Branch Post Office in the United States. Thirteen of these stations rank as first-class Post Offices; an interesting fact when such "first-class" offices as Albany, Troy, Indianapolis, Newark, Syracuse, and many others fall considerably below these branch stations in the volume of postal business.

Existing conditions at the New York office will doubtless soon be largely improved, upon the report of the Postal Commission appointed by the Postmaster-General to consider a reorganization and increase of the several branch stations, sub-stations, and stamp agencies. While all that is now needed may not be accomplished, for lack of appropriation, much of benefit will ensue.

The entire force at this office numbers 1,225 carriers, 1,614 clerks, 34 superintendents, and 100 stamp agents. The Postmaster receives a salary of $8,000 per annum and gives a bond for $500,000; the cashier receives $2,600 per annum and gives a bond of $50,000; the superintendent of the money order department, $3,200, bond $50,000; registry department $3,200, bond $50,000. Superintendents of stations "A" and "D" receive a salary of $2,500; superintendents of stations "E" and "F" each $2,200; "B," "C," "G," "H," and "P," each $2,000; "O," $1,800; "R," "K," and "L," each $1,700; "W" and "J," $1,500 each; "M" and "S," each $1,000; and "T," $1,400. The average salary paid to clerks is $845. Many employees with families receive but $600 per annum.

The carriers' hours are limited to eight by law; the clerks have no specified hours of labor; and in the registry department, money order department, in the general post office and branch stations, the men are not unfrequently called upon to work from 12 to 14 and sometimes 18 hours a day.

The Classification Bill, now before Congress, will, if passed, secure to postal clerks and others in the service, compensation approximately commensurate to their deserts.

Considering the fact that the total volume of business at the New York post office for the last fiscal year was upwards of $7,000,000, and that its net contribution to the revenue of the Government was upwards of $4,000,000, and also the fact of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these enormous transactions and the inadequate compensation allowed and paid to all the force, our citizens should not only be highly gratified with the efficiency of those who do such onerous and responsible work, where temptation is aggravated by the smallness of pay received, but should heartily recognize the almost invariable honesty and zeal of those who so thoroughly perform the details of this great and exacting public service.

The present method of sending mails between the General Post Office and the Branch Office Stations is by the old-fashioned wagon service or by messenger service on the elevated railroads. Owing to the lack of proper facilities, the elevated railroads are unable to run express trains except during the morning and evening, the result being that it takes one hour for a letter to reach Harlem from the General Post Office. Numerous suggestions have been made looking forward to having the pneumatic tube system put in operation in New York city, but owing to the large expense that this would entail, no person or corporation has been found willing to put in the plant as an experiment. The sum of $196,000 is now paid yearly for the transportation of the mails in the city; but it is certain that the constantly increasing bulk of the mails will, at no distant day, render the employment of some means for their more frequent and rapid transportation an absolute necessity. The inventive genius of the American will, doubtless, solve this problem, to the satisfaction of the Department, Congress, and the public.

This being an exchange office for foreign mails, for money orders and registered matter, also the receiving office of 25 per cent. of all second-class matter mailed in the United States, its rank precludes comparisons as to cost of maintenance. There are no two post offices in the country working under the same conditions. Each office should be conducted according to its surroundings. The delivery system in such cities as Keokuk should not be controlled by conditions prevailing in New York, nor should salaries of carriers, clerks and superintendents in New York be regulated by the cost of living or the character of work in such places as Yankton. Nor should the larger offices of the country be subjected to the endless confusion, friction, and annoyance arising from the "duly considered" correspondence and "red tape" of departmental clerks at Washington.

The postal system of the country, organized in 1789, when the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

population was about 3,000,000, is still conducted on the same general principle: that is to say, postmasters at the largest offices are charged with maximum responsibilities and a minimum of power; even to the expenditure of five cents for a penholder or a bottle of mucilage, unless by written direction of the department at Washington. To illustrate: it is desirable or necessary to change or establish a branch station. The postmaster must communicate that fact to the department; the department refers it to a post office inspector, who investigates without any obligation to consult the postmaster; the place is selected on the recommendation of the post office inspector, and the postmaster receives word that the post office inspector will be sent to see that the station is properly fitted up. This post office inspector may be one appointed from New Mexico, while the selection of a site and the fitting up of a station in any large city should be based upon intimate knowledge of the postal needs of that city.

Such a state of affairs is sought to be remedied by Postmaster-General Bissell, who says in his report for 1893:

"I would be glad if these (the post-offices at New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Boston, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Brooklyn, San Francisco, Baltimore, and Pittsburg) could be placed in a class by themselves and the appropriations made for them by Congress direct, without the interference of rules and methods as to allowances that are properly applicable to other post offices."

This proposition has unfortunately been defeated by the refusal of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads of the present Congress to approve it. I believe, however, that the sound business sense of this plan will ultimately prevail, and as a result responsibility will be accompanied by power. Each Post Office so classed will thus be enabled to regulate its management in accordance with its environment, resulting in greater efficiency, in increase of business, and still further, in a compensation to the men who do the work, proportionate to the extent, amount, and importance of the work done; and my judgment further is, that the outcome of this plan will be additional revenue instead of a deficiency in the Post Office system.

The New York office will, within a year, probably yield a net revenue of about $5,000,000. Its work stops neither night nor day, holidays nor Sundays. Its force is insufficient and overworked; the accommodations provided for most of its branch stations and its main office are unworthy the system which so largely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

helps to maintain that part of the government which it represents.

Much has been said regarding the feeling of jealousy existing towards the city of New York in other parts of the country. So far as the postal service is concerned, such a sentiment should have no place; because whatever is done to improve the service here finds immediate reflex of benefit everywhere throughout the land. The sooner the merchant can have his order for goods delivered here, the sooner the goods will be delivered; and so with the constant interchange of finance, no matter how far distant the point of interchange of letters; and thus it is that the perfection of the postal service in New York means that other cities of the Union near and far, will grow towards occupying corresponding positions in the problem of postal magnitude and postal perfection.

There is no branch of the government nearer to the daily lives of our own people and to "all sorts and conditions of men" the world over. True economy in its administration consists in liberal appropriations, carefully and intelligently expended; and for every dollar so properly invested the government will receive, as it does in this city, a plentiful return.

CHARLES W. DAYTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN EGYPT.

BY MADAM ADAM.

As France refused to shed Egyptian blood and to take part in the odious bombardment of Alexandria, she ought all the more energetically to have prepared herself for her peaceful struggle against the occupant of Egypt, thus serving her own interests, those of the oppressed people, and of those numerous colonies of strangers, which give to Egypt her peculiar character of internationality.

Every struggle allows of the choice of arms. Now what can one think of a combatant who is simple enough to change his weapon every day, and imprudent enough when he begins to use it well to deliver it over to his adversary? This is what the French government has done in Egypt since its occupation by the English. I shall first take for example a series of facts—as to the relationship which the traditional policy of France should desire to see continued between the governments of Egypt and of Turkey.

France had perhaps sustained Mehemet Ali in exaggerated fashion against the Sultan; Napoleon the Third was eager to obtain firmans which would deliver Egypt, under Ismail, from excessive vassalage and sanction its internationality. Tewfik, on ascending the Khedival throne, careful about the opinions of the foreign colonies in Egypt, had no idea of going to Constantinople to receive investiture and to make a personal act of submission.

When Abbas Pasha ascended the throne the English had not entertained for an instant the idea of sending the young Khedive to receive investiture at Constantinople, in spite of their conviction that one day or another—if Egypt returns to her traditions of vassalage—it would be the colonies of foreigners, always ready to resist the occupation of Egypt, who would suffer most. The Foreign Office has long known that at a given moment the Porte

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may have diplomatic, financial or military need of England, and at that moment she may extort from it the protectorate of Egypt as she extorted that of Cyprus.

The English advisers occupied themselves only with negotiating with the Sultan on the subject of the firman of investiture to be received at Cairo.

The negotiations had for their object the transforming of Egypt's administration of the territories of Akaba and Sinai, in Arabia Petrea, into a definitive incorporation into Egypt itself, so that when the day of total absorption should arrive England should possess an important frontier on the Asiatic coast and both banks on the north of the Red Sea.

France then had a diplomatic success with which it would have been wise to rest contented. The Sultan replied to the English demands by publishing an *iradé* declaring that Akaba and the points occupied by Egypt on the east side of the Red Sea should be comprised in the Turkish vilayet of Hedjaz, and that for the peninsula of Sinai the *status quo* would be maintained. The ground, for the first time since "the occupation," was solidifying under our feet.

The Khedive had felt that the influence of France, combined with that of Russia at Constantinople, could overcome that of England and check it. The native population felt that we were not passive in the face of what was occurring, and this was an advantage which should have been satisfactory for the time. But our diplomacy—one knows not in truth why—and at the very time when the young Khedive was trying to encourage the pride of the natives by his own pride; at the very time when he was allowing the foreign colonies to foresee the possibility of some day finding again, in Abbas II., a proper representative of the Khedivate of Ismail, leaving to the foreign colonies the free play of a development which was exercising itself in favor of general progress; at that hour, I say, our Minister at Cairo, following either his own individual idea or the instructions of our government, commenced a systematic effort to deliver the Viceroy of Egypt again to the complete vassalage of the Sultan.

Our diplomacy was thus made to serve the future interests of England, the Ottoman influence being that on which finally English diplomacy has most power to act.

The rescript of the Khedive on his departure for Constanti-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nople was lamentable and of extreme importance in the sense that I indicate. In appointing Riaz Pacha, Kaimakan, that is to say Regent, Abbas II., used a phrase that neither Mehemet Ali nor Ismail nor Tewfik would have employed :

"Having made arrangements by the grace of God to repair to Constantinople to lay our respectful homage at the foot of our august Master, his Majesty the Sultan, etc."

This voyage, which superficially might appear as a provocation to England—the English advisers being opposed as a matter of form to it—French diplomacy gloried in as in a success, and her colony at Cairo had the imprudence to applaud it. The Sultan, who is one of the finest and most astute diplomats, took care not to neglect such advantages. He covered the young Khedive with flowers, but he made him follow the grand Vizier—thus reminding him that he was only a simple "Vali," and that Egypt is simply a Turkish province.

Thus, for an apparent success, French diplomacy forgot its traditional policy: Egyptian autonomy, and its separation from Turkish authority. At that moment I uttered a warning cry which, had it been heeded, might have saved the situation.

To-day they are talking of a direct understanding between London and Stamboul, and we have there, as I said at the commencement, not only changed our weapons, but surrendered our arms to England.

If France continues to act blindly so as to undo the work of fifty years, she will create with her own hands danger for the future. A direct understanding between England and the Porte may one day be very costly to Downing Street, but will help it to conquer a legal title in Egypt in the easiest manner. What results for our policy and for the independence of Abbas II. as regards England has the voyage of the young Khedive to the banks of the Bosphorus had ? Results more than negative.

Through the flowers that were thrown to keep up appearances before the Mussulman world there was administered to the "vassal" at Constantinople a lesson which the English advisers of Cairo would not have repudiated.

Certainly Abdul Hamid could not answer with too much haughtiness the supplications of a faithful people, whose spokesmen addressed him in terms like these :

"O Khaliff, we humbly approach thee, in submitting to thee, that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stranger who came into our country, with false pretexts and with promises, periodically repeated, to go away, remains in occupation.

"O Khaliff, it is the land of Egypt, it is the sacred soil, it is the doorway of Mecca and Medina, whose people come before thee in tears, on account of him who is thy vicar, and thy representative, to render thee homage.

"Receive him with favor because he and we are blindly subject to thy will.

"Deliver us from the presence of the stranger, for we are like the bird caught in the net of the snarer, and put an end to our tribulation by the power of the sword of the Khalifate."

But so far the young Khedive has obtained nothing, not even the recall of the Ottoman Commissioner, of whom Abbas Helmi Pacha complained as not being sufficiently opposed to the English.

It is an illusion to believe that the Porte will ever break with London, where rightly or wrongly she expects help in the hour of financial crisis, or political peril. It is therefore a grave fault to have urged the Khedive to go to Dolma-Bagtché, and to have accentuated by act and by word the homage laid by the vassal at the foot of his august master.

If our diplomacy answers the fears of the "previsionists," as to the "opportunist" policy, by alleging that nothing has been lost, I would remark (beyond the bad results of the abandonment of a traditional polity, and of the greater intrusion of Turkish authority in Egypt) that in the place of an ardent young Khedive, impatient of the yoke, desirous of enfranchising himself, and thinking himself capable of doing so—and in consequence determined to push his way ahead—we shall see a Khedive more prudent, less audacious, as a result of the counsels of patience that have been given him, and who for the future will reflect twice before assuming a responsibility, or making a bold decision.

No personality is more engaging than that of the young Khedive trying to find an outlet through all the obstacles with which he is surrounded and with which the pathways of his destiny are blocked. Who knows if the Khaliff did not tell him to submit himself to England in the same manner that his father, Tewfik, appeared to submit himself. I use the term "appeared," for Mr. Chaillé Long, late United States Consul, ex-colonel in the Egyptian army, and chief of the American Military Mission under Tewfik, wrote to me after a speech by Mr. Gladstone:

"Mr. Gladstone praises Tewfik, and among the hitherto unknown quali-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties of the late Khedive he attributes to him loyalty and devotion to Great Britain. I know myself the contrary. Tewfik told me, in an interview that I had with him in 1889, *that he cursed the English, that he detested them cordially; and he explained to me the horror and the hatred he felt for their domination and occupation of his country, which weighed horribly upon him.*"

Tewfik unable to control himself showed his spirit of revolt against the oppressor, and secretly placed himself in communication with the National party of Egypt. Then he died suddenly. His death fulfilled the wishes of Lord Salisbury. With Tewfik and his secret opposition getting more and more courageous, the noble Lord had anxiously awaited the approach of the general elections. Thus, he was ready for all audacities.

The very young Khedive who succeeded his father was of an age to submit without the least reservation to the most absolute tutelage. But note this mischance—at the first command given by Lord Cromer the English pupil revolted.

In an interview Lord Cromer explains his displeasure in words which give a shock of cold to one's heart. He said of Abbas II.: "He is young, *he has not yet suffered like his father the effects of rebellion, and perhaps he does not yet know the power of England.*"

Will the young Khedive be victorious over his tyrants, or will he be vanquished by them? It is to be desired that he may be clever and capable, so that he can extricate himself from the English machinations, and train the Egyptian people, so little as yet prepared for it, to assimilate the idea of nationality.

A book of the highest interest, which unveils the thoughts of England about Egypt, whose author is Mr. Milner, appears to me to sum up the question as follows:

Passive obedience of the Khedive of Egypt, who is bound to consider all "advice" coming from England as an "order."

"We have only the right to give counsel to Egypt," says Mr. Milner.

But Lord Granville, who is not often accused of being vigorous in his expressions, showed clearly to Sir Evelyn Baring in 1884 *that counsel did not differ from command.*

"It is indispensable," wrote Lord Granville, "for the government of Her Majesty, that the advice given the Khedive be followed. The ministers and Egyptian governors *who do not follow this policy must resign their positions.*"

Mr. Milner further cites the phrase of Lord Dufferin: "The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all-powerful hand of a resident will soon have curbed all under his will."

Thus Abbas Pacha can neither choose nor change one of his ministers without the authorization of his English adviser.

This pretension was made public on the occasion of what is known in England as the *coup d'état* of the young Khedive. In what diplomatic convention did the delegate of England, salaried by the Egyptian Government, acquire the sovereign right of *veto*?

England has not attempted to justify her temporary occupation except by proclaiming in an official act, at the bottom of which is the signature of her representatives, that she occupies Egypt only to maintain internal peace to aid in the proper working of the administration, and finally to give up Egypt to the Egyptians.

Perfidy and falsehood!

The most sincere man in England, the editor of *Truth*, Mr. Labouchere, wrote:

"The real gravity of the situation is that, up to the present time, we have justified our occupation and the violation of the undertakings which we have given Europe, by making the pretext, that we are prolonging the period of the occupation for the greater happiness of the Egyptians. It is not possible to play this game any longer, and to get people to believe we are in earnest.

"Rightly or wrongly, the Egyptians like better to govern themselves than to be governed by us. The action of Abbas is so manifestly approved by all his people, that we are strengthening our garrisons, not to defend Egypt against the Soudanese, but to defend our occupation against the Egyptians, and yet we are considering the simple expression of the natural aspirations—in favor of our departure—as a crime of high treason. . . . Like the Irish, the Egyptians want home rule. We cannot call this sentiment patriotism with the Irish, and treason with the Egyptians."

Voices are lifted up from time to time in England against the cynicism of the Egyptian occupation, but they are rare, and provoke the imprecations of the majority of the Liberal party itself, in spite of the promises made by Mr. Gladstone when he was leader of the Opposition.

Concerning the Blue Book published in March–April, 1893, and the dispatch of Lord Rosebery to Lord Cromer, which recalled to the young Khedive a lesson too soon forgotten, the *Globe* declared that it is

"Clear that England under a Conservative or Gladstonian Government will not retreat before her responsibilities."

The mockery of a speech of Mr. Gladstone, who humorously proved that France had not the same rights in Egypt as England;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the comedy of the interpellation of Sir Charles Dilke, stating after this public declaration that "even if the Liberal Government *did nothing towards carrying out its promises of evacuation* he, Sir Charles (author of *Greater Britain*), would not propose a *vote of want of confidence.*" All went to prove that the Liberal party, then in power, had in its policy towards France one more fault than the Conservatives—impertinent hypocrisy.

Mr. Milner argues "that the Egyptians are incapable of acting for themselves as soldiers, as well as in civil affairs." They have, he says, need of being commanded and supported by individuals of "a superior race."

English pride is unbounded. Do we not know by the *Standard* of May 11, 1893,

"That there only is one Empire on the earth, the English Empire, and that the English race belongs to what Macaulay calls 'the hereditary aristocracy of humanity'"?

From time to time a loyal spirit tells the truth to his country, but he is forthwith classed as an eccentric individual, like Mr. Labouchere or Mr. Wilfrid Blunt, who published an article in the *Nineteenth Century* which attracted general attention, in which he confronts England with the falsehoods that she had heaped on the benefits of her occupation of Egypt.

A characteristic illustration of the tendency of the English—to find identical resources in all arguments good, bad or contradictory—is the astounding reply of the *Pall Mall Gazette* of March 29, 1893, concerning the picture of chaos and disorder made by Mr. Blunt.

"All that is false, but if it were true it would prove that England cannot abandon Egypt."

Unskilfulness, contradiction, disorder, waste, administrative injustice, inefficiency, unsurpassed crimes of "creatures" of the English, cruelties of the police—such is very nearly the balance sheet of occupation. Here and there certain monstrosities like the odious article in the *Egyptian Gazette* throw a sinister light upon the Egyptian situation.

"The line of conduct of England," ventured to write the official organ of England at Cairo, "appears to be to allow the inhabitants of the Upper Nile to die of hunger, just until those who survive have arrived at such a state of utter feebleness that the work of conquest will offer no further difficulty." To satisfy the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bondholders, to pay them a high interest, such is the sole ideal of her English advisers in Egypt; then under cover of this guarantee to ruin and starve Egypt, so as to place her more easily at its mercy. The holder of Egyptian bonds only sees one thing—27 millions of surplus in 1892 for the public revenue of that year, and 45 millions of surplus deposited for the payment of the debt. As to Egypt, if she exhausts and devours herself, what does that matter to the bondholder? When the English speak of their hard task, when they speak of a reserve fund of the debt, of the cultivation and perfected crops, and of abolition of *Bakhsheesh*, now driven away, they tell nothing new to those who have lived in Egypt under the reign of Ismail or Tewfik, at the epoch of the control of the condominium. At that period, things worked at least as well as now in Egypt. There was *a real reserve fund*, and the debt diminished, whereas it has increased 30 per cent. during English occupation, which is a pertinent fact. As to the contracts for public works and supplies there, no Egyptian will admit that they are transacted in regular and legal fashion, which is also a matter of some gravity!

These assertions have obtained for me the honor of being roughly handled by the partisan English press of Egypt, but they were never seriously denied.

Lord Granville exaggerated, in 1884, the reported ruin of Egypt. Further than this, by financial quotations, of which art the English are masters, and through all the jugglery, the balance of the budget of Cairo goes on improving.

But, while the apparent resources grow larger and salaries and pensions increase, England is multiplying new offices. She often undertakes public works which are frequently as excessive in number as they are useless.

Yes, Egypt pours into English coffers more money than she paid into Egyptian coffers, but neither the *fellahs* nor the general commerce become enriched in the same proportion. It is, therefore, by exhaustion and not by the creation of new resources that this has been done, and it remains to be discovered if Egypt has found in the cost of her new administration any compensation for her sacrifices.

To that one can answer "No," for the English themselves at Cairo are forced to admit to what an extent all the public ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vices are neglected. One of my friends wrote to me from there some time ago:

"The sanitary condition of Egypt is the cause of daily complaints. In Egypt, constantly threatened with cholera from India, the appropriation for sanitary purposes only amounts to seventy thousand pounds for the care of its five millions of inhabitants, while the rate of mortality reaches occasionally sixty per thousand."

The defective organization of the Egyptian army is notorious. They have not, moreover, ceased to lead them to certain defeat—in fighting the Soudanese.

The instruction of the army is deplorable, and what they have learned comes from the French and American missions, which the English wish suppressed. The only thing that the English have been forced to keep intact is the military school, which is in the hands of a Frenchman, Larmée Pacha, who could not be replaced, "the English not having sufficient instruction to take charge of the school." This is the exact phrase used by Larmée Pacha to Colonel Chaillé Long, who repeated the words to me. In an access of alcoholic folly did not an officer of the army of occupation burn the precious documents and scientific reports, the fruit of thirty years labor, of the officers of the French and American missions?

The English have so little faith in their famous reorganization of the Egyptian army, that they constantly reënforce the army of occupation, which from 3,000 men has been increased to 10,000, thus further exhausting impoverished Egypt for this new expense. From time to time the English generals drag a portion of the native army to the Soudanese frontier. Then the tragi-comedy recommences. They repel an incursion of dervishes, a certain number of Egyptian soldiers are killed, and thus the "Soudanese peril" so dear to Lord Salisbury is renewed.

It would be necessary to devote many pages to prove that England deliberately lowers the standard of studies for the youth of Egypt, and that she endeavors to keep them in a state of ignorance which guarantees the invader against the claims of a host of young and educated patriots.

Those who continue the work of Mr. Milner will have a good opportunity in a few years to declare that the Egyptians are without any personal valor and need to be led by a superior race.

All the documents that have been communicated to me, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I have caused to be published and circulated by all the means in my power—by the press, by pamphlets and by republication, etc.—if I could give them in a short review article, would, without possible refutation, confirm what I have just advanced.

Here is one of the documents that I have received from a trusty source, and that I have already published :

"Mortgages on real estate and land in Egypt, which from 1883 to 1891 increased to the enormous extent of 30 per cent., are still increasing on account of the severity with which taxes are collected from the farmer. The mortgagees purchase for £15, sometimes for £10, lands which two or three years ago were worth £30 the feddan. At the present moment the lands of Lower Egypt, *belonging to native farmers*, are mortgaged at an average rate of 10 per cent. As a result of this, in about four years the half of these borrowers lose their lands."

All that is the fruit of the occupation and of the systematic exploitation of the toiler, who fosters against the European a dangerous and daily increasing hate. On every side he runs against English implacability. Spurned, driven back, he is on all occasions the prey of those who invaded his country, with the solemn promise of helping him to govern it, and to deliver up Egypt to the Egyptians. They tell the oppressed one that he is poor and without intelligence—and they try to make him poorer and more stupid.

If I were to enumerate at length the English traps in which France and her agents have allowed themselves to be caught, the list would be a lamentable one.

The project of judiciary reform as expounded by Mr. Scott contains one of the gravest dangers to which foreign colonies are exposed in Egypt.

The matter may be summed up as follows—native jurisdiction is not yet in our hands, but we are preparing Egypt for its destiny of servitude to ourselves.

We will people it with our friends and creatures, and we will so manœuvre that by and by the life and property of Europeans will be entirely at our discretion, and then we will dispose of Egypt. We will surround the fusion of mixed tribunals and native tribunals with all the appearances of guarantees and all imaginable promises. We will employ all the terms known to diplomacy, we will yield, we will make formal concessions, but we will gain our point.

When we shall no longer be hampered by the Consular Courts,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vestiges of a former epoch, and when we shall have lessened the power of the Court of Alexandria, we shall say to the Powers that, having suppressed for the Egyptians purely national jurisdiction they cannot require us to maintain for their benefit on the soil of Egypt all these foreign and distinct jurisdictions. "The arguments invoked for the creation of the Reform tribunals we will use in favor of our recombinations," say the English, and thus the Consular Courts and the "capitulations," the only protection for Egypt against our final *seizure*, will no longer exist.

What have we done up to the present time to struggle against the manœuvres of our rivals, of our enemies at Cairo? By what acts have we practically and continually protected Egypt against her gradual seizure by perfidious Albion? When have we taken in hand the interests of the oppressed Egyptian people? We have done nothing in favor of the oppressed ones and, worse still, we have been opposed to the abolition of forced labor. Our agents have often appeared not only to be tired of the contest against England, not only to be powerless to continue it, but more than once the attitude of our Ministers at Cairo has been, as one of our national Deputies recently informed me, "a source of encouragement to anti-French enterprises."

And it is at the solicitation of our agents that our government has given its consent to the worst measures against the future of France and the French colonies in Egypt.

Except in two instances—that of the license law, and the action of the Sultan as to Akaba and Sinai—let us frankly admit that since 1882 we have given up all courageous, intelligent, and far-seeing resistance to the English invasion of Egypt.

But now at last we clearly understand the rôle played by England for the past ten years—which is established by a thousand proofs—that in place of increasing the prestige and authority of the Khedive, she has lowered and broken them; that instead of aiding the native capacity in its development, she has simply crushed it; that sooner than help the local element, or enlighten the national spirit of Egypt, England would weaken them, and place her sinister influence upon them; that, in short, instead of working for the reorganization of Egypt for the benefit of the Egyptians, she has with implacable hate done her best to make such reorganization impossible.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is necessary to conclude. To-day we have tested the probity of the Liberal party of England and its loyalty to its promises—let us struggle with the only arms that remain in our hands. Let us defend the rights of the people of Egypt; let us also protect those of the foreign colonies; let no concessions be made as to treaty rights; finally let us co-operate by our support with the Khedive, not in intrigues, but in his legitimate sovereignty, with the final aim, in accordance with equity and with the law of history, of restoring Egypt to the Egyptians.

JULIETTE ADAM.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A LAST WORD ON THE SOUTH CAROLINA LIQUOR LAW.

BY THE HON. B. R. TILLMAN, GOVERNOR OF SOUTH CAROLINA, AND THE HON. W. F. DARGAN, MAYOR OF DARLINGTON, S. C.

GOV. TILLMAN:

THE experiment of legislation for the control of the liquor traffic which has been made in South Carolina, during the year beginning July, 1893, has excited widespread interest. In previous articles in THE REVIEW I have given my opinion as to the merits of the Dispensary system, together with such facts as were then obtainable, tending to show the superiority of the Dispensary over the licensed saloon, from a temperance standpoint. Everything promised a speedy and almost total suppression of the illegal traffic in liquor, when, on April 19 last, the Supreme Court by a vote of two to one declared the Dispensary law unconstitutional.

It would be difficult to describe the surprise and disgust manifested by a large majority of our people when this intelligence reached them. The constitutionality of the law had been sustained by the United States Circuit judge; seven out of eight of the State Circuit judges had sustained the law; the Liquor Dealers' Association, of Charleston, had employed the best legal talent in the State, and had received it as the opinion of the attorneys that the law was impregnable and could not be attacked on its constitutionality. The Supreme Court itself, in a previous case arising under it, in May, 1893, unanimously declared:

"The only question really involved here is whether said act violates the constitution in forbidding the granting of licenses to retail spirituous liquors beyond the 30th day of June, 1893, and to that question we have confined our attention, and have reached the conclusion that the said act, *being in effect an act to regulate the sale of spirituous liquors*,—to do which is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

universally recognized,—it is quite clear that there is nothing unconstitutional in forbidding the granting of licenses to sell liquor except in the manner prescribed in the act."

To aggravate the situation the division between the judges was along political lines, the dissenting judge, who upheld the constitutionality of the law, being a reformer, or "Tillmanite," while the two controlling judges are "antis," and belong to the old *régime*. The friends of the law naturally denounced the decision as a political and partisan one, and the change of base by the judges from the position held in the previous May, in the Chester case, already cited, together with the forced and inconsequential arguments adduced to sustain it, lend color to the charge.

For far-fetched, unnatural, and strained construction and illogical deductions, this decision will stand as a monument to show how far judges will go when prejudices or feelings are allowed to influence their minds. Goodwin says of Lord Coke that "where precedent failed, he had recourse to the invention of a principle to justify him in deciding as he pleased." Our Court has gone further than this. It has "invented" new principles and overturned the best established old ones to find excuse for this decision. It out-herods Herod and out-cokes Coke; and so muddy was the decision that no two lawyers in the State could agree as to what was the *status* of the liquor traffic under it. The only thing made clear was that the Court declared the Dispensary law to be unconstitutional.

Let it be understood that the Act upon which they were passing was the first Dispensary law, approved December 24, 1892. After considering the law in all its bearings and having had experience of its benefits for six months, the General Assembly had strengthened it, clarified it, and improved it in December last. As every question of constitutionality had been presented to the Court in May, 1893, two months before the law was to go into effect, if the Court had any doubt as to its constitutionality it was clearly its duty to stop the State from committing the wrong of "driving its citizens out of business" and of "monopolizing" the liquor traffic for itself. But the judges could not then see as clearly as they did a year later, when they asserted that "the Dispensary law conflicts with the following sections of our State constitution:

Article I, Section 1: "All men are born free and equal—endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are the rights of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enjoying and defending their lives and liberties, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and seeking and obtaining their safety and happiness."

Section 14 of the same article: "No person shall be despoiled or dispossessed of his property, immunities, or privileges, or deprived of his life, liberty, or estate, but by the judgment of his peers or the law of the land."

In order to present the arguments which I shall advance to show the constitutionality of the law, I must briefly give the grounds upon which the Court overthrew it. Quoting the above paragraphs from the State constitution, they next declare the law to be in conflict also with the following from the 12th section of Article I: "No person shall be prevented from holding, acquiring, and transmitting property." After expatiating on the inalienable right of personal liberty and private property, the court quotes with unction the following from Mr. Justice Bradley (*First Abbott's U. S. Reports* 388):

"There is no more sacred right of citizenship than the right to pursue unmolested a lawful employment in a lawful manner. It is nothing more nor less than the sacred right of labor."

The idea of speaking of the liquor traffic as an inalienable right of "personal liberty and private property," or describing a bar-keeper standing behind his counter and dishing out poison as one of those possessing the "sacred right of labor"! To bolster the claim that the liquor business is legitimate, the Court then cites the decision of the United States Supreme Court, Leisy vs. Hardin (135 *U. S., page* 100). This is the celebrated "original package" case from Iowa. The Court ignores altogether the fact that Congress by the Wilson Act has overridden the Supreme Court in that case and has expressly placed whiskey under the absolute and direct control of the State Legislatures, possessing none of the rights attaching to any of the ordinary articles of merchandise under the Interstate Commerce law.

The judgment goes on floundering from one *non-sequitur* to another, and announces the following:

"Now, while the power of the legislature to enact such laws as may be deemed necessary and proper to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors by any person within the limits of the State, in order to prevent or at least to reduce as far as possible the evils which are apt to flow from such a traffic, is conceded, yet we cannot regard the Dispensary law as such an act."

Indeed it must be a contradiction in terms to speak of an act of such a character as this is as an act to regulate the sale of liquor by the people of the State, for it is difficult to see how an act forbidding a sale can be regarded as an act regulating such sale.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That which is forbidden cannot well be regulated. This is the very profundity of legal acumen and common-sense! If liquor is forbidden to be sold by any one, excepting bonded State officers, and those officers are forbidden to sell it unless it has been chemically analyzed and placed in certain sized sealed packages to be sold within certain hours at a certain price, under restrictions naming the purchaser of every package—minors and drunkards being barred the right to purchase—if this is not a well-regulated business I would like to know the meaning of the word "regulated." But the Court proclaims aloud: "You have created a monopoly, and the State usurps the inalienable right of her citizens." Let us see. A monopoly, in law, is a franchise or privilege enjoyed by some one person or corporation, from which all others are shut out. How can the State government, which is the representative of all the people when it assumes control of a recognized nuisance to protect the people, and uses the emoluments of the business as a fund in the State Treasury for the benefit of all the people, be said to create a monopoly? If a monopoly at all, it is a monopoly of the whole for the benefit of the whole, both as a matter of police regulation and as a matter of profit, and is the very antithesis of a monopoly. As the profit feature is purely a matter of administration and may be destroyed, and a loss created by a change in the price, there is no principle involved; and when the Court announces, as it does, that if there were no profit in the business it would be constitutional, it surrenders its whole contention.

Discussing the question of the State going into business in competition with its citizens, the Court tells us that this is unconstitutional. It is idle to deny, for our experience of nine months has shown it to be true, that the State alone can handle the liquor traffic as a business with any degree of satisfaction in minimizing the nuisance inherent in it. When licenses were required and liquor allowed to be sold only in incorporated towns, as was the law here prior to the Dispensary system, a monopoly was created in two ways. The towns had a monopoly as against the country (decided by this same Court to be constitutional), and those who obtained licenses, which were fixed according to the judgment of the municipal authorities, obtained a monopoly under protection of the State law, for which a price was paid, and the State was bound to see this monopoly protected. There were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regulations, both municipal and legislative, against sales on Sunday and sales to minors. They have never been enforced, and experience shows that they cannot be enforced, simply because of the political influence exercised by the barkeepers upon the officers charged with that duty. It cannot well be claimed then that the sale of liquor by the State is a "business" in the ordinary acceptance of the term. She assumed control for a specific purpose; that of policing and regulating the traffic. The profit is an incident and, as I have shown, may be eliminated; but is necessary, in the interest of temperance, to prevent the encouragement of consumption by making the liquor too cheap. But it is not such a bad thing, nor has it been held unconstitutional by our courts, State and national, for the United States Government or for the State governments to go into "business." The United States Government is in the business of transporting the mails, has made it a monopoly, and protects that monopoly by stringent laws. It is in the business of manufacturing arms and building ships. It is in the business of printing and engraving. The United States also went into the business of building railroads, very extensively, about twenty-five years ago, (and giving them away,) if not directly, still indirectly. The State of New York long ago went into the business of building canals, greatly to the benefit of her people; the State of Georgia went into the business of building railroads direct, and still owns a line from Atlanta to Chattanooga, worth nine million dollars. None of these things has been considered unconstitutional. But whenever society has attempted, through legislation, to stifle the evils of the liquor traffic the courts have always been prone to throw obstacles in the way and place the constitution, State or national, in the pathway of reform. It is a sacred word, but many sins are committed in its name.

Our Court has reversed its own opinion inside of twelve months. It has enunciated doctrines of law, in its recent decisions, that are contrary to all the accepted principles and repeated decisions of the United States Supreme Court. Take this opinion for instance. On the question of the "inalienable right" of the citizen to sell liquor, upon which so much stress has been laid, in Mugler vs. Kansas (123 *U. S.*), Mr. Justice Harlan said:

"Such a right does not inhere with citizenship, nor can it be said that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the government interferes with or impairs any one's constitutional rights of liberty or of property when it determines that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating drinks for general or individual use as a beverage is or may become hurtful to society, and constitutes therefore a business in which no one may engage."

Again, Mr. Justice Field, in Crowley vs. Christiansen (137 *U. S. Reports*, 91):

"Their sale in that form may be absolutely prohibited. It is a question of public expediency and public morality and not of federal law. The police power of the State is fully competent to regulate the business, to mitigate its evils, or to suppress it entirely. There is no inherent right in a citizen to sell intoxicating liquors by retail. It is not a privilege of a citizen of the state or of a citizen of the United States. The manner and extent of regulation rests in the discretion of the governing authorities."

Congress has since put liquor at wholesale or in original packages in the same category.

Then take this opinion on the constitutional power of the General Assembly of a State, in the case of Giozza vs. Tiernan (148 *U. S. Reports* 661), by Chief Justice Fuller:

"Irrespective of the operation of the federal constitution, and restrictions asserted to be inherent in the nature of American institutions, the general rule is that there are no limitations upon the legislative power of the legislature of a State, except those imposed by its written constitution. There is nothing in the Constitution of Texas restricting the power of the legislature in reference to the sale of liquor; and it is well settled that the legislature in that State has the power to regulate the mode and manner, and the circumstances, under which the liquor traffic may be conducted, and to surround the right to pursue it with such conditions, restrictions, and limitations as the legislature may deem proper."

It would be difficult to make language stronger or to put the question at issue in a more clear and convincing light. There is a radical distinction between the power of Congress, under the United States Constitution, and the powers of a Legislature of a State. In brief it is the accepted rule, and universally recognized, that the federal government has no rights, nor powers, and Congress cannot legislate, except under an explicit grant from the federal constitution; while the State Legislatures can do anything and enact any law not forbidden by the State constitutions. The sections of our State constitution which have been quoted by our Supreme Court as conflicting with the Dispensary law, and therefore nullifying it, can in reason receive no such interpretation. In fact they do not bear on the question at all.

Most men would no doubt contend for the inalienable right to drink whiskey; no sensible man, of this time, will contend for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

an inalienable right to sell it. There being no prohibition, express or implied, in our constitution to prevent the State's selling liquor in the exercise of its police power, the argument falls to the ground; and the people, through their representatives, have the right to pass on the wisdom or unwisdom of the law in question. It is usurpation pure and simple, for the judges to stand up and say to them, "You shall not regulate the liquor traffic in this manner."

Will the people of South Carolina submit to this? is the question that mostly interests the outside world. Unless I am egregiously mistaken, they will not. Once before when our Supreme Court, in 1832, attempted this kind of usurpation the Legislature met and abolished the Court. The people in the United States are the source of all political power. They are greater than constitutions and courts. They make and can unmake both. Fortunately, at the coming election in this State, the question of calling a constitutional convention will be voted on. The Dispensary will be one of the principal issues in the campaign about to begin. The friends of temperance may rest easy. The South Carolina experiment is not dead, nor is it likely to die. The Dispensary law is stronger with the people since the decision of the Court than it was before; and if it be necessary to give the direct power to the State to enter into business, the people will incorporate it in the organic law. I repeat it as my deliberate judgment that the Dispensary system has come to stay, and that if it is not constitutional it will be made so. In face of the decisions I have cited, however, and the arguments advanced, it appears to me impossible for any reasonable man to deny that the law is a legitimate exercise of the police power, and that it is just as constitutional for the State to sell liquor as for the State to license its sale. If the State can prohibit its sale altogether—and this no one is bold enough to deny—the State can do anything less, for the whole is greater than any part.

B. R. TILLMAN.

MAYOR DARGAN:

GOVERNOR TILLMAN'S article entitled "Our Whiskey Rebellion" in the May number of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW is calculated to mislead the thinking public, and as a representative

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Darlington I feel it my duty to present a few facts, for the verification of which I invite investigation.

Our people are not champions of whiskey, and the men who dare maintain their rights as against Governor Tillman or any one else, as a rule, are not identified with the liquor business; on the contrary some of them are strong prohibitionists, and are advocates of peace, law, and order. I venture the opinion that not one-tenth of the sellers of liquor in this State are native Carolinians.

A few years ago the people of this old commonwealth, tired and torn by the troubles and trials incident to the war, broken in spirit and fortune, and striving to adjust themselves to the new order of things, had turned their attention to the building up of their broken fortunes, and were learning and teaching their children in the sad school of adversity, patience, and endurance. They were giving but a passive attention to politics, which they allowed to be run by men whom they had been taught to love and honor for their patriotism and sacrifices.

In 1890 Governor Tillman rose up with charges of incipient rottenness against the powers that be, entered upon an active crusade of agitation, made charges against everybody and everything the people had believed in, arrayed class against class, appealed to the prejudices of the "wool hat" and "one-gallus boys," incited the farming population against the towns; and made the most extravagant promises as to the good that would follow his election. He made overtures to the Farmers' Alliance and obtained their support. To his standard flocked all political malcontents and sore-head politicians who had for years failed to secure office from the Democratic party. He was elected. His object being accomplished and no rottenness or crookedness appearing, he had to confess that his charges were unfounded.

No realization of the many promises being apparent from his first administration, in the next campaign he told the people that the Legislature had failed to do its duty, and that if they would send him a Legislature that would do as he told them, he would give all the reforms he had promised. In this campaign of 1892 the *sine qua non* for office was belief in Governor Tillman. In most of the counties no one could be elected, no matter who or how capable, unless he professed to be a "Tillmanite."

At this Democratic primary the Prohibitionists had a box

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

where each voter was requested and urged to vote for or against prohibition. The result of the primary was about 10,000 majority for prohibition, and both houses of the Legislature were overwhelmingly carried by the "Tillmanites." When the Legislature met, several prohibition bills were introduced and the fight was on between prohibition and high license. The majority of the "Tillmanites" were pledged to prohibition, but Governor Tillman is not a prohibitionist; thus these subservient so-called representatives of the will of the people were "betwixt the devil and the deep sea"; they had promised their constituents to vote for prohibition, and their master did not wish prohibition. So when he, within forty-eight hours of adjournment, had prepared his now celebrated Dispensary bill, and tacked it on as an amendment to a prohibition bill, then about to be passed, by striking out all of the latter except its title, and substituting the Dispensary bill, it passed. It is not supposed that one-half dozen members of either house ever heard of such a system before, and it would have been an impossibility for such a measure, so introduced, to pass that or any other legislative body except under this peculiar condition of affairs.

This Dispensary bill has been declared unconstitutional and a subversion of the functions of government, by our Supreme Court; hence it is useless to discuss its merits or demerits. Though extremely stringent and drastic in its many provisions, having been gotten up hurriedly, it was very imperfect, yet it recognized local option. A dispensary could not be placed in a prohibition town or county, and before it could be established in any town a majority of the freehold voters had to join in a petition for it.

In 1893 when the Legislature met, another Dispensary bill was passed, and its measures were still more severe and arbitrary. One or more dispensaries could be established for each county in the State, with this difference: that to prevent its establishment a majority of the voters of the township in which such dispensary was to be located had to be obtained to a petition requesting that no dispensary be established in that township, whereupon some other place could be designated. In counties, towns, and cities where liquor-selling was prohibited by law a dispensary could be established upon a petition, signed by one-fourth of the qualified voters of such county, town, or city, being filed with the county

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commissioners, or town or city council, respectively; then an election was required to be held, submitting the question to the voters of such county, town, or city, and if a majority of the ballots cast was found to be for a dispensary it was required that one be established. In two of the prohibition counties, Williamsburgh and Marion, an exception was made, and dispensaries could be established without such election. In the neighboring town of Timmonsville, where liquor-selling had been prohibited for years by its charter, a dispensary was established with the aid of negro votes and against the earnest protest of the most intelligent voters and property-owners of the town. Thus it appeared to be the policy of the administration to establish dispensaries wherever money could be made out of them.

The Dispensary Law amply provided for its enforcement, authorizing the appointment of as many constables as were deemed necessary. The methods resorted to by these constables in their search for contraband liquor were often as annoying as they were novel. Of all the reckless acts of the Governor, the selection of some of these men has been the most unpardonable. While a few of them are sensible men of experience, most of them are desperate characters.

On the morning of March 28 the authorities of Darlington received a letter from the Governor stating that the Dispensary profits would be withheld after April 1, for the reason that he had been informed that the police were obstructing the constables in the discharge of their duties. The Governor says that this letter "added to the anger of the mob." That this letter added to the anger of anybody in Darlington is an assumption on his part, as we had received letters of this nature before, and the authorities, having determined to test the question in the courts at the proper time, were not concerned about the Governor's communications. And as a matter of fact his information was incorrect; on the contrary the police, in accordance with their instructions, rendered every assistance to the constables, and accompanied them in the raids.

The Governor's statements that "large numbers of armed men gathered in the streets" and that "the five or six constables in Darlington were followed by this armed mob, which guyed, cursed, and abused them," are without foundation, the fact being that no constable or body of constables was ever followed in that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

town by any armed man or body of men; and yet after this body of five or six constables had executed every process in their hands except one, and had broken into one private apartment without a warrant, meeting with no resistance, Governor Tillman ordered from Charleston his chief constable, with a force of seventeen men, armed with pistols and Winchester rifles. Before doing this he had ordered out the Darlington Guards, without the request of any civil officer in the county, and on the next day, when his band of constables arrived in Darlington, he ordered the Sumter Light Infantry to report to the sheriff at Darlington, in face of the fact that he had been assured by the sheriff of the county, the mayor of the town, and the captain of the Darlington Guards that no troops were needed, as no trouble was anticipated, and all was quiet. The ordering of these constables to Darlington was announced in the morning papers, and naturally caused apprehension and excitement all over the State, and especially in the neighboring town of Florence. The advent of this unusual number of armed men into our peaceful community excited anxiety among our best citizens, as no cause could be assigned for their coming, yet there was no assemblage of persons, and no demonstration whatever. A few of the citizens of Florence and Sumter, being apprehensive, came to Darlington, and as they with our people could see no reason for this display of force, they naturally supposed that Governor Tillman would order his constables, backed by the State militia, to search private residences, even of citizens who did not make bar-rooms of their homes. They met therefore in an orderly manner in the Courthouse, and passed resolutions to the effect that they did not propose to have their residences searched by whiskey constables, and notified the constables of their action, but at the same time informed the sheriff that any process placed in his hands could be served without resistance, even were it for the search of a private house. They had no intention of protecting any one who made a saloon of his residence, but fully intended to defend their homes. This meeting was not composed of whiskey sellers, but in it were some of the best men in the State. They assembled as they had a right to assemble, made their intentions known, and quietly dispersed to their respective homes. These are the conspirators to whom the Governor so persistently refers. Upon the following morning the only re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

maining warrant in the hands of the constables was served without the least interest or demonstration on the part of the citizens, and in the afternoon four of the constables went to one depot and nineteen to the other to take their departure.

Governor Tillman says: "Two boys, citizens of the town, got into a fight at the depot where the main body of the constables was. One of them, who was whipped, ran up town, and returned, followed by an armed mob." The fact is that the young man alluded to, on his way to town, in the omnibus, met five other young men walking to the depot, one of whom was to take the train. He got out of the omnibus, told them he had been imposed on, and wished them to return with him and see fair play. To this they agreed. It turns out that of these five young men, three had pistols on their persons and participated in the fight with the constables. One was killed, and one shot in five different places. This was the composition of the "armed mob" which followed the young man back to the depot. In the fight were two other citizens, besides the chief of police with one assistant, who were commanding the peace. These men armed with pistols, all, except one, of less than 38 calibre, were pitted against nineteen constables armed with the most improved rifles and pistols.

We will not attempt to give an account of the fight, how it occurred, or who precipitated it. The record has been made and by the Governor himself. That the investigation by the coroner, and its results, should be absolutely unprejudiced, he appointed a military board of inquiry to sit with the coroner's jury, to hear the evidence, through the coroner to examine witnesses, and to make its report to him. This board was composed of four officers and one private, who were from different sections of the State, unconnected with and unknown to our people. After reviewing the evidence, they in a written report unanimously found that the constables started the trouble, that two of them were guilty of felonious murder, and that fifteen others were accessories. When this conflict was reported up-town, a mile distant, the sheriff and mayor called on the captain of the Darlington Guards to assist them in maintaining the peace, supposing at the time that the fight was still going on. The company turned out immediately and marched to the scene with the sheriff and mayor, where they found the participants had all dispersed, and that quite a number

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of citizens had started in pursuit of the constables. Posses were immediately started by the writer in all directions. Before the arrival of the officers on the scene, some of the citizens who had preceded them, being under the impression that the constables had gone across to the other depot and got on the train then due, ran to the crossing where it usually stops. The train did not stop, and they fired into it as it ran by. This was the only unlawful act committed in the town of Darlington. It was inexcusable, and was condemned by all. The only palliation is that the men who committed this deed were wrought up to a state of frenzy by seeing the dead and bleeding bodies of their friends and comrades, and supposed the perpetrators of this dastardly deed were on this train about to escape.

As has been stated, the eyes of the State were on Darlington, and when it was heralded abroad on the evening of March 30 that the constables and citizens had clashed, the impression prevailed, that Governor Tillman, in fulfilment of his many threats, had ordered the constabulary to search private houses; that our citizens were defending their homes; that the Governor wished to back up the constables with the State troops, and knowing full well that he was capable "of giving commands of such an outrageous kind as to override law, decency, and justice," when he ordered out the troops of Columbia and Charleston they refused to respond, and chose rather to cast their arms at his feet. He caused by his untoward action this impression to prevail throughout the State, and the troops were right and acted properly with the lights before them. Our volunteer troops as a rule are composed of the very best elements in the State. They are intelligent and know as well when duty calls and will respond as quickly and endure as long as any in the United States. They are the men, and those who lead them, to whom South Carolina will look, and not in vain, when her real trouble comes. They did right in refusing to obey; and had the real facts, as they were subsequently learned, been what they were at that time supposed to be, the Governor could not have massed at Darlington a corporal's guard of the regular troops, and by the time his farmers reached here they would have been met by the best men in South Carolina, and some from other States, and among them would have been found many a "wool hat" and "one-gallus boy," as he is pleased to call them. But we are thankful that the facts were not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as they were supposed to be, as the Governor tried to make them, and as he would have liked them to have been, at least until he found that there were men still left in South Carolina. In response to the many offers of assistance we wired promptly the real state of affairs. When it was ascertained that our people were willing to have troops come here, then it was that the Governor of South Carolina was enabled to march some 300 men up the hill and down again. The Governor also says, "I was informed by the sheriff that the civil authorities were powerless in Darlington, and was asked to order out the militia." One not in possession of the facts would suppose that the sheriff had requested the Governor to order out the militia. The fact is, the sheriff made no such request; and prior to the conflict, when the officers of the Darlington Guards and Sumter Light infantry reported to him under the Governor's orders, he expressed surprise and told them he had no need of them; and this fact was reported to the Governor.

Again, the Governor says, "One of the most potent factors in the suppression of the rebellion was the seizure of the telegraph lines and the railroads." It is hard to say whether the Governor was serious in making this statement or whether it was a piece of facetiousness on his part. The only point in South Carolina that this place could not at all times communicate with by wire was Columbia; and as for trains, we could have had as many as we desired at any time.

On the 31st of March, Governor Tillman issued a proclamation declaring that:

> **"Certain persons have assembled in the Counties of Darlington and Florence, and are now in open rebellion against the authority of the Government of this State, and it has become impracticable to enforce the ordinary course of judicial proceeding of the laws of this State," etc.**

This was a wanton exercise of power, as certain persons had not assembled in the counties named in open rebellion against the authority of the government, and it never was impracticable to enforce judicial proceedings; on the contrary every process had been fully executed without resistance, by the officers charged therewith.

In restoring the civil status on April 5 he issued another proclamation in which, after reciting the terms of the first, he says:

> "The commanding general has just informed me that the insurgents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have dispersed, and that peace and order are restored, and that the civil authorities are now able to employ and enforce the law."

There was about as much accuracy in this as in the other. The commanding general never made any such report. On the contrary, when the Adjutant-General of the State arrived in Darlington in advance of the commanding general and his troops, and on the night after the day of the fight, after reviewing the situation, he reported to the Governor that "to all appearances the town was unusually quiet," and in his report says "as a matter of fact it was unusually so," and that the people "seem not only quiet, but sad, depressed, and melancholy." In the face of this information the troops under the commanding general, arrived the next night, and he reported that "good order and quiet prevail in the city."

W. F. DARGAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO MAKE WEST POINT MORE USEFUL.

BY F. A. MITCHEL, LATE CAPTAIN AND AIDE-DE-CAMP, U. S. V.

THE annual examinations at West Point have been concluded, and a new class of ex-cadets is turned out to grow old as captains or lieutenants in the army, or to seek a different kind of promotion in civil life. The Military Academy remains the same as when our fathers* and grandfathers were graduated there, to be attached to the army as brevet second lieutenants. American universities have been constantly enlarging in every sense. There are more courses, more professors, more students. Why, then, do the West Point cadets still constitute the same little battalion as fifty years ago ?

It may be considered an unwarranted innovation to suggest any change for West Point; indeed few people consider any change necessary. There is a growing disposition to arbitrate disputed international questions, and war every day seems more barbarous. But it is questionable if the time has yet come when any people can afford to neglect military education. As the Supreme Court is the final means of settlement of all constitutional questions by peaceful methods, so is war a final refuge when all peaceful methods have failed.

Three main elements enter into the military dependence of the United States : the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Volunteers. In time of peace there is but little connection between the first and the second, and no connection between the second and the third ; for the Volunteers force only exists in time of war. The Regular Army and the National Guard exist always ; and since in time of war the Regular Army is expected to leaven all the United States forces, and the National Guard is

* The writer's father, Ormsby McKnight Mitchel, was a graduate of West Point, class of 1829; the writer's brother, also Ormsby McKnight Mitchel, was graduated in 1865.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to form a basis for the Volunteers, a connection between the first and the second is a proper subject for consideration. Prior to the Civil War no attempt had been made to disseminate any influence of regulars through the National Guard. Of late years a few officers of the army have been detailed for duty with the State forces at different points, but under the present system it is questionable if they can be of service except as drill masters. Thus far no direct well-established link between West Point and the National Guard has even been suggested.

West Point, when it was established, in 1804, was intended to turn out some half a hundred cadets a year to serve as officers for a force of about 20,000 men—a representative standing army for a nation of ten or fifteen millions of people, whose only anticipations of war were with Indians. The true value of the Military Academy did not become apparent for fifty years after it was instituted, for the only two wars occurring during this period were that with England in 1812, which occurred simultaneously with the founding of the academy, and the war with Mexico, a comparatively small affair. Only a dozen years after the Mexican war the nation suddenly woke to the consciousness of the fact that she needed a great army. A struggle was upon her more gigantic, more extended, of greater variety, than any the world has ever seen. A million of men were enlisted as volunteers. But where were the officers to come from? There were perhaps 1,500 in the regular army, but no more than were necessary to officer that army. There were perhaps 1,500 West Point graduates in civil life who could be called on, and this was the limit of the nation's resources in educated officers. There was the militia, but beyond the drill in arms they were very ignorant of military service. The consequence was that the war had no sooner opened than a great demand sprang up for West Point graduates. The volunteers must be drilled, clothed, fed, armed, and furnished with ammunition. Assistant adjutants-general were required to superintend the clerical work; ordnance officers to furnish arms and ammunition; engineers to construct forts, railroads, bridges; quartermasters and commissaries to distribute clothing and food—in short, a small army of especially educated officers was needed to fill the staff corps alone. After the men had been enlisted, organized, and equipped, they must be fought. Fifty thousand officers were required to lead them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The comparatively few West Point officers available were made general officers, in some cases Colonels in the line, but rarely could be obtained for any less important position. The bulk were placed where they were most needed, in the Staff Corps. As engineers, assistant adjutants-general, quartermasters, commissaries, ordnance officers, they were soon exhausted at the headquarters of the Army at Washington, or at the main points of organization and supply in different parts of the country. The old army, depleted of most of its officers, was filled up with citizen appointments. The militia, after serving a few months under its own organization, sent many of its members into the volunteers to serve as officers. But even with the militia to draw from, the bulk of volunteer officers at the outset knew no more about the military service than the raw recruits they commanded. The militia officers were largely available as drill masters, but all, except the West Pointers, were lamentably ignorant of that code deduced by long experience for the management of an army, the "Army Regulations."

West Point graduates necessarily took the lead at the start and held it to the finish. At first there was a disposition to give a preference to those who were in the old army at the opening of the war, and to regard those who had resigned as of secondary consideration, but it was soon discovered that those who had left the army for civil pursuits were of equal value with their comrades who had confined themselves to the duties of a soldier. Indeed, they had in many instances added to their value by an experience acquired in civil engineering, transporting goods, and other peaceful duties, while an absence from army routine had rendered them more patient and efficient with volunteers.

The result of organizing this improvised army and putting it into the field officered by men not familiar with army system was a great deal of suffering among the troops. The nation could afford to give them clothes, food, equipments, transportation; but all these must be distributed. It is the duty of the officer to see that the necessities of his men are provided for. But few of the officers of the volunteers upon their entry into the service knew how to properly write a requisition. While requisitions for overcoats were being returned for informality, the men were chilled by November winds. They were often delayed in getting rations, shoes, blankets, indeed, any or every thing to make their exposure endurable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One in need of food and clothing has very little patience with one who denies him on account of informality; therefore, there arose from the Atlantic to the Mississippi the cry of "red tape." True, there was red tape in abundance, but not enough to prevent a number of disbursing officers hanging about Washington for months after the close of the war, in a vain endeavor to settle their accounts. Had each regiment been able to secure educated staff disbursing officers, there would have been comparatively little trouble. But as the West Pointers were few and the militia had never been instructed in aught save the drill, there were no more educated disbursing officers available than for the main depots of supply. Had the militia who served as officers of the volunteers been something nearer to real soldiers than simply drilled soldiers, there would have been a sufficient number to supply and equip all the volunteers.

Considering West Pointers as leaders of armies, they made the same showing as in the staff corps. At the outset civilians with no military education, but prominent as political leaders, were in some instances given important command, but as the war progressed it became apparent that those who were educated in the science of war, if they were no more efficient, at least inspired greater confidence. Notwithstanding the good work achieved by citizen leaders, no one of them ever was intrusted with the command of a large army. Of the West Pointers an important fact was soon demonstrated, that it was not essential for even general officers to have served continuously in the regular army. Those graduates who were appointed from civil life proved as successful in generalship as those who had been always exclusively soldiers. Indeed there was often a disposition on the part of a general whose education had not been applied as it could only be in active civil life, to attach too much importance to the rules of war learned from books, to the exclusion of practical common-sense. Of four great leaders who came out at the end of the war as central figures, two had left the old army for civil pursuits. Grant and Sherman were reappointments, Thomas and Sheridan were regular officers. But it is safe to say that of the West Pointers nearest the rank and file (colonels, lieutenant-colonels, or majors), those who were in civil life after service with the old army were most efficient with volunteers.

The war taught us then, first, that a military education is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

essential, and second, that no disadvantage results from the educated soldier going into civil life in time of peace, to resume his mental and physical equipment in time of war. Why, then, has West Point, after the nation has been taught this lesson, been suffered to remain in the same status as when it was founded?

In the first place, there was a great deal of prejudice engendered from the fact of so many West Point graduates entering the Confederate Army. Secondly, as has been stated above, many officers whose scope had not been enlarged in civil pursuits were too much wedded to theory, and among a number there was an ill-disguised contempt for the volunteeer. These causes are now largely lost sight of, but it will be a long while before the nation will forget that at West Point she was educating men to turn against her in time of her necessity, and any attempt to enlarge the Academy would be met by this important, though illogical, argument. The main cause to-day for leaving West Point as it is is a well-grounded opinion that she now turns out more officers than are required to officer 30,000 men, and that 30,000 men are enough for the standing army of the United States.

The war demonstrated, however, that West Point graduates are necessary in case of need, and that after graduation no detriment results from entering civil life; why then should not West Point turn out men in far greater numbers to enter upon civil pursuits at graduating? And as the National Guard is the next most important resource in case of war to the regular army, why should not these young men pay for their education by a stated term of service with the National Guard?

General Grant has been quoted as saying that there should be 1,000 men at West Point; but if he left a plan for putting and keeping them there it is not known to the writer. To educate a man in one or more branches of the military service would require from one to four years of training. The full course of four years is now considered a proper time to educate cadets in all the branches, to enter the army as officers. An additional number of cadets might be appointed to study, some one, some two, and some three years, to be scattered at graduation through the National Guard, to transmit what they have learned at West Point. The three-year man might choose a number of electives to include all except the higher studies of the fourth year; the two-year man, such studies as would be best fitted to go with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

his drilling in staff and line duties; while the one-year man would simply be drilled perhaps in the line and instructed in a single staff corps, studying what most nearly pertained to his specialty. This would give the student an opportunity to become proficient as an assistant adjutant-general, an artillery officer, a cavalry officer, or in such other corps as he might elect.

It is not the purpose of this paper to suggest a plan, but to indicate the expediency of educating more young men at West Point to serve with the National Guard. Two important points remain: to discover the additional equipment and expense essential, and to make a practical status for the West Point graduate in the National Guard. The former would be a part of the general plan of educating more men, and should be treated by an experienced graduate of the Academy; the latter pertains especially to the National Guard and should be treated by an experienced National Guardsman. It would doubtless involve changes in the laws governing the State forces, and would be of little or no value unless the men were more directly brought under the control of their officers and the State or General Government. Their status as soldiers should be intensified as far as possible without interfering with their condition as citizens. The winters should be devoted to instruction; the summer encampments should take on such discipline as prevails at West Point.

Such a consummation would bring West Point up to the status of the great American universities (though in a military line), which have entirely outstripped it. As at the university, there is the student pursuing the regular academical course, so at West Point is the cadet being educated to officer the regular army. As at the university, there is the special-course man, so at West Point we should have the student in the duties of quartermaster or commissary, or of an infantry, artillery, or cavalry officer. The National Guard, which is now a vast improvement on the militia prior to the Civil War, would take a still greater stride forward. Every year would see several hundred West Pointers entering its organization to bring its discipline up toward a regular-army standard. Lastly, in case of a great war, we would have the whole National Guard ready as trained soldiers, instead of having to make soldiers of raw material.

F. A. MITCHEL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE AIMS AND METHODS OF THE "A. P. A."

BY W. J. H. TRAYNOR, PRESIDENT OF THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE ASSOCIATION.

IF THE American Protective Association owed an apology for its existence either to the people of the United States or to humanity at large, I for one should not be among its apologists, nor should I at this moment occupy valuable space, and to me and those I serve much more valuable time, in a condensed exposition—not defence—of its principles, and the conditions which have brought about its existence, in reply to Mr. Lathrop's article entitled "Hostility to Roman Catholics," which appeared in the May number of this REVIEW.

By way of preface, I wish to state that, denying as I do the catholicity of the Papal church and the pretensions of the See at Rome, it would be inconsistent in me to use the term "Roman Catholic" or "Catholic." Therefore in substituting "Papist" and "Papacy," I but wish to be understood as alluding to that ecclesiastical government of which the Pope is the head and to the followers thereof—not in any sense with a desire to be discourteous or derisive.

Mr. Lathrop has asked: "Why should not Catholics enjoy equal freedom, as citizens, to hold opinions on morals or education, to engage in politics or government, to advance them?" The question is a pertinent one, and the reply hinges upon the definition of the term "Catholic"—the prefix "Roman" being conceded. Webster defines a (Roman) Catholic as "an adherent of the Church of Rome." We have now to determine by evidence whether the assumptions of the Papal church are consistent with good citizenship.

There is no obscurity in the position taken by the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States in the matter of allegiance; the State requires most perfect and complete fidelity and obedience to the Republic. The voice of the Papacy is no less uncertain; it demands the unqualified obedience of its adherents to the Pontiff. Thus Cardinal Manning, speaking in the name of the Pope, has said:

"I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no civil power; I am the subject of no prince, and I claim to be more than this. I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men, of the peasants that till the fields, and of the prince that sits upon the throne; of the household that sits in the shade of privacy, and the legislature that makes laws for kingdoms. I am sole, last, supreme judge of what is right and wrong. Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary to salvation to every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

All of which may be found in Quirinus (Appendix I., p. 832) and the *Tablet* of October 9, 1864.

I now quote from Manning's *Decrees and Civil Allegiance*, p. 54, where the Cardinal says:

"It is clear that the civil power cannot define how far the circumference of faith and morals extends. . . . If the church cannot fix the limits of its jurisdiction, then either nobody can or the state must. But the state cannot unless it claim to be the depository and expositor of the Christian revelation. Therefore it is the church or nobody. This last supposition leads to chaos. Now if this be rejected, the church alone can; and if the church can fix the limits of its jurisdiction, *it can fix the limits of all other jurisdictions.*"

The same authority, in *Cæsarism and Ultramontanism*, p. 36, argues:

"Any power which is independent and can alone fix the limits of its own jurisdiction, and can thereby fix the limit of all other jurisdictions, is, *ipso facto*, supreme."

The following from an address delivered by Pope Pius IX., of infallibility fame, July 21, 1873, is pertinent:

"There are many errors regarding infallibility; but the most malicious of all is that which includes, in that dogma, the right of deposing sovereigns, and declaring the people no longer bound by the obligation of fidelity. This RIGHT has now and again in critical circumstances been exercised by the pontiffs . . . its origin was not the infallibility, but the AUTHORITY of the Pope."

It is denied by many that the Papacy demands the temporal allegiance of Papists. Let me quote the following from an Encyclical of Leo XIII., November, 1885:

"We exhort all Catholics to devote careful attention to public matters, and take part in all municipal affairs and elections, and all public services, meetings, and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. All

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of states to be modelled on the principles of the true church."

The Revised Statutes of the United States declare:

"The alien seeking citizenship must make oath to renounce forever all allegiance and fidelity to any foreign prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty, in particular that to which he has been subject."

The obligation of the oath of allegiance to the United States, from the point of view of a Papist, may be measured by the following:

"No oaths are to be kept if they are against the interests of the Church of Rome."—*Corpus Juris Canonici*, Leipsic ed., 1839, p. 1159.

Again:

"Oaths which are against the Church of Rome are not to be called oaths, but perjuries."—*Ibid*, p. 358.

Again, Pius IX. asserted to himself the right to annul the constitutions and laws of certain countries, viz., New Grenada, in 1852; of Mexico, in 1856; of Spain, in 1855, and of Austria in 1868. See *Acerbissimum*, Sept. 27, 1852; *Nunquam Fore*, Dec. 15, 1856; *Nemo Vestrum*, July 24, 1855; *Allocutio Nunquam Certe*, June 22, 1868.

The foregoing, it will be seen, are authorities of comparatively modern date. One authority even more recent deserves insertion here, under the head of civil allegiance—

"We command all whom it concerns to recognize in you (Francisco Satolli) as apostolic delegate, the supreme power of the delegating pontiff; we command that they give you aid, concurrence, and obedience in all things, that they receive with reverence your salutary admonitions and orders. Whatever sentence or penalty you shall duly declare o. inflict against those who oppose our authority, we will ratify, and, with the authority given us by the Lord, will cause to be observed inviolably until condign satisfaction be made." "*Notwithstanding constitutions and apostolic ordinance or other to the contrary.*"—Extract from encyclical of Pope Leo XIII. to the Papal clergy in the United States, January 24, 1892.

Thus we see that the Papal hierarchy declares its complete sovereignty over the state, and, in utter disregard of the constitution and the laws of the land, decrees that the Papal fiat is superior to the voice of the people; and that the Papists of the United States yield acquiescence and obedience to this assumption of authority is shown in the following:

"We glory that we are, and, with God's blessing, shall continue to be, not the American church, nor the church in the United States, nor a church in any other sense, exclusive or limited, but an integral part of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Jesus Christ."—*Acta et Decreta Concilii Plenarii Baltimorensis Tertii*, p. LXXVI. (Baltimore, 1886.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Nor are there in the world more devoted adherents of the Catholic Church, the See of Peter, and the Vicar of Christ than the Catholics of the United States."—*Ibid.*

The position taken by the Papacy regarding matters of state, as illustrated by the authorities quoted, and a hundred others equally as pertinent, form the fundamental reasons for the existence of the American Protective Association, although it is doubtful whether, if these conditions had existed as a theory only, the organization would ever have been anything more than a mere name. It was the active and aggressive application of the temporal claims of the Papacy by its subjects in this country that made the perfection of the "A. P. A." not only possible, but an actual necessity, our legislators, for the greater part, being either unwilling or too corrupt to deal with an issue in which their personal interests had become inextricably involved.

Mr. Lathrop makes an unfortunate reference to "ballot or bullet." This expression has been used, so far as I have been able to learn, exclusively by members of the Papal church; notably by Monsignor Capel, who threatened with "bullets" the school-tax collector; and by the Jesuit Sherman, who, from the public platform in Chicago, less than six months since, advocated the use of "free bullets" in preference to free speech.

Opinions among Romanists may differ as to who seeks to "trail 'Old Glory' in the dust"—he who hauls it down upon St. Patrick's or any other day to replace it with the emblem of another nation or race, as so frequently done in New York and other large cities, or he who declares that it shall be all-sufficient for those who live upon American soil. To the members of the American Protective Association there can be no question of its all-sufficiency. We have had many instances of priests of the Papacy refusing to admit to their churches and cemeteries deceased members of the G. A. R. until the "stars and stripes" had been removed from the coffin.

"Arms in Catholic churches" or rumors thereof, is a matter that needs neither confirmation nor refutation. It is sufficient that Papist societies, from which non-Papists are religiously excluded, armed with rifles and bayonets, may be seen upon the public streets at any important Roman Catholic celebration. Why these armed companies exist or whether they store their arms in churches, convents, or lodgerooms and armories, are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matters which come within Mr. Lathrop's province to determine; it is enough for me that both men and arms are actual and visible auxiliaries to the Papal church.

Parenthetically the following item from the New York *World* of April 27, dated from San Jose, Costa Rica, April 26, is significant:

"Relations between the government and the church party are strained, owing to discoveries of arms stored in convents."

I have yet to learn that General Sheridan was as "good" a Papist as Mr. Lathrop would make him appear. If the brave general was a "good Catholic" he believed in the temporal power of the Pope; if he did not so believe, he was a Papist only in name. It is as much a heresy to deny a dogma of the Papal church as to deny the church itself.

Mr. Lathrop refers generally to those "colonial families" who were members of the Papal church, and particularly to his own pedigree, ranging over two hundred and sixty years; yet he neglects to inform the readers of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW that nearly all—if not all—of these ancestors of whom he is justly proud were not Papists in any sense of the word, and among the signatures upon the Declaration of Independence I fail to discover one *bona-fide* Roman Catholic. Carroll, of Carrollton, was the nearest approach to a Papist, yet he was evidently a most indifferent one, and the last to sign the Declaration.

Mr. Lathrop says:

"We (Roman Catholics) are bound to obey the laws of the state when they are not contrary to the law of God."

Very clearly put; and as Cardinal Manning asserts that "it (the Church) can fix the limits of all other jurisdictions" besides its own, the reason is easily discoverable why Papists oppose the public school, and, in defiance of the Constitution, demand public money to support sectarian institutions, and why, also in defiance of the Constitution, it has for many years past used the garb of sanctity as a means whereby to absorb the political offices of the country, as in New York, Chicago, St. Louis, New Orleans, San Francisco, and all other important cities of the United States, wherein from 60 to 95 per cent. of the public officials are papists.

"Neither the church nor its American members are trying to break down the public-school system," Mr. Lathrop asserts, but here again I prefer the authority of Pius IX., who denounced the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

public schools as "godless" and threatened with anathema all who dared to send their children thereto. I would also refer Mr. Lathrop to the decrees of the Councils of Baltimore upon this matter.

Mr. Lathrop is undoubtedly a "good Catholic," for he quotes St. Thomas Aquinas as an authority upon "what constitutes cause for revolution by the people." The reference is most happy; and before returning St. Thomas to the shelf I take occasion to refer to Vol. 4, p. 90, where I find the following:

"Though heretics (*i. e.*, all who are not 'good catholics') must not be tolerated because they deserve it, we must bear with them, till, by a second admonition, they may be brought back to the faith of the church. But those who, after a second admonition, remain obstinate in their errors, must not only be excommunicated, but they must be delivered over to the secular power to be exterminated."

In passing let me call attention to an extract from another Papal authority—this time a decree passed by the council of Lateran in 1215, and declared by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Foley, of Chicago, under oath on Dec. 30, 1870, before the Circuit Court of Kankakee, Ill., to be a law of the Papal church to-day:

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy that rears its head against the holy orthodox or catholic faith, condemning all heretics, by whatever name they may be known, for though their faces differ, they are tied together by their tails. Such as are condemned are to be delivered over to the secular powers for punishment. If laymen, their goods must be confiscated. . . . Secular powers of all ranks and degrees are to be warned, induced, and, if necessary, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, to swear that they will exert themselves to the utmost in the defence of the faith, and extirpate all hereties denounced by the church," etc.

In the whole range of history was ever a stronger argument than this submitted as a reason for the existence of an organization for the conservation of American liberty?

The assumption of the Papacy to control in politics was illustrated most fully during the recent debate upon the civil-marriage bill in Hungary. The moment the state claimed the right to legalize civil marriage, the church created almost a revolution to defeat the claim, acting upon the self-asserted right of *defining its own jurisdiction*. Even so with our public schools; the state declares that they shall be non-sectarian, yet in defiance of the state the church sends its nuns and priests into the public schools of Pennsylvania and elsewhere to teach Papal dogmas.

The Constitution declares that no appropriation shall be made

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for sectarian purposes; the church, *defining its own jurisdiction,* demands a portion of the public money for the support of Romish parochial schools. The State declares the right of free speech; the Church permits its subjects to reject this principle, and they attack and attempt to murder public lecturers at Lafayette, Ind.; Kansas City, St. Louis, and scores of other places.

Closely allied to the principle that underlies the liberty of conscience is *freedom of speech and of the press.*

The First amendment to the Constitution reads:

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech or the press."

Yet, in the light of this, Leo XIII., in a letter, June 17, 1885, says:

"Such a duty (obedience), while incumbent upon all without exception, *is most strictly so on journalists* who, if they were not animated with the *spirit of docility and submission* so necessary to every Catholic, would help to extend and greatly aggravate the evils we deplore."

A writer of the *Catholic World,* in an article published July, 1870, entitled "The Catholics of the Nineteenth Century," explains the position of the Papists on the question of free speech and of free press. He says:

"The supremacy asserted for the Church in matters of education implies the additional and cognate function of the censorship of ideas, and the right to examine and approve or disapprove all books, publications, writing, and utterances intended for public instruction, enlightenment, or entertainment, and supervision of places of amusement. This is the principle upon which the Church has acted in holding over to the civil authorities for punishment criminals in the world of ideas."

Yes, Galileo was a splendid example of the Papal "censorship of ideas." Wycliff, Huss, Bruno, and many thousand victims of the Spanish Inquisition are a few other early instances; and the attempted assassination of public speakers within a few months in the United States may be taken as illustrating the later days of Rome's censorship, leaving no room for doubt (in the human mind) that the Papal boast, *Semper eadem,* is quite true.

In marked contrast is the behavior of members of the "A. P. A." when the defenders of Rome have attacked them either in public or private. There is yet an instance to be cited of a blow struck or a shot fired to avenge either an insult to Protestantism or the order. That cause is a poor one which needs force to defend it against moral argument. It is strange, too, that where

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the voice of civil authority has been raised in vain against riot and bloodshed the priests have been able to restore peace with a fews words; notably in the cities just named. It serves to emphasize what the "A. P. A." and Papacy alike have always claimed that the Papist places the church above the state, and canon law above civil law; such divided allegiance is impeachable in the light of the American Constitution.

Permit the Papacy to carry out its aggressive policy, as defined in its canons and decrees, and its methods such as have been pursued in the United States for many years past, and what would become of our boasted constitutional prerogative of free speech and free press?

The minor issues raised by Mr. Lathrop may be disposed of in a few lines. First:

The American Mechanics do *not* admit any one to their order who is not American by nativity. Again, why should they not "wear swords at church"—even as the Knights of St. John and other Papist societies wear them? Why should they not exclude Papists from their order, with the example—half a century old—set them of the Papal orders excluding non-Papists from *their* military, semi-military, and "benefit organizations"?

The American Protective Association has not, nor ever had, any "organ." In my address to the Supreme Council in May last I for the first time advocated the establishing of one.

The assertion that the A. P. A. has urged commercial proscription of Papists, either directly or indirectly, is absolutely incorrect. On the contrary, it has constantly set its face against such an un-American measure. As a matter of fact, the "secrecy" of the order against which Mr. Lathrop inveighs so bitterly is entirely due to the fact that members of the "A. P. A.," when suspected or known to be such, have been so mercilessly boycotted as to drive them out of business, and not unfrequently out of the towns and cities in which they lived.

In regard to the alleged purchase of arms by the "A. P. A." of Toledo, Ohio, the report, like the assertion, is false *in toto*. A clause in the constitution of the order prohibits any but legal political measures on the part of its membership. A military body organizing under the charter of the order would subject the members thereof to expulsion.

The organization does not recognize its members as "Protest-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ants" from a religious point of view, but only by reason of the fact that they *protest* against ecclesiasticism and corruption in the affairs of state. Comprising in its membership, as it does, Jews, theosophists, deists, spiritualists, free-thinkers, adventists, and other believers in Deity, it cannot be considered as "Protestant" from a religious standpoint.

Regarding the matter of so-called "A. P. A. riots," Mr. Lathrop is just as lamentably ignorant as upon other matters connected with the organization. In the case cited, the press of Kansas City stated that the mob set upon and endeavored to murder the lecturer, that he had to fly for his life, etc. In the Columbus matter Mr. Lathrop is equally at sea. The facts are that a young girl *was* detained at a monastic institution against her will, and was released by due legal process, for the details of which I refer Mr. Lathrop to the Columbus court records.

Mr. Lathrop, while evincing the most unmistakable and inexcusable ignorance regarding the "A. P. A.," has had the extremely bad taste to denounce it as "ignorant and stupidly malicious." Hard words neither break bones nor strengthen a weak cause in the eyes of the intelligent, and, moreover, the organization referred to does not consider an amendment to the Constitution necessary to prohibit sectarian appropriations; for the reason that the Constitution has fully declared itself upon this point.

I would suggest that Mr. Lathrop consult the fundamental principles of the Union as diligently as he has the interests of the Papacy. Another glance at the Constitution should convince him that denominational control of public schools is unlawful.

"If religion itself or the political rights of Catholics be threatened, the Pope may advise defensive action, either by abstention from voting or by the formation of a party, etc." So quotes Mr. Lathrop, yet he denounces the "A. P. A." and kindred societies when they assert that Romanism is political as well as ecclesiastical. Where in the Constitution does Mr. Lathrop find provision made whereby a foreign priest may define the rights and duties of American citizens?

The schools of Switzerland are referred to. Mr. Lathrop is all abroad; this is neither Switzerland nor the Vatican, but the United States—a fact which seems to have been overlooked by him.

Are there not bishops and cardinals in the Papal church who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can speak for the Papacy? Is it that the Papal authorities are as afraid to place themselves upon record as our legislators seem to be? I might well be excused from replying to Mr. Lathrop, for he officially represents no one's opinions but his own, while I have the honor to represent those of more than two millions of my fellow-citizens.

I trust that whosoever hereafter undertakes to defend the Papacy and impeach the "A. P. A." and kindred associations will be a person of some authority in the Papal church, whose utterances may be placed upon record to stand for all time. Meantime the "A. P. A." continues to grow and thrives amazingly, including in its ranks scholars and statesmen of the first magnitude, who, comparing the canon law of the Papacy with the Constitution, have come to the conclusion—Mr. Lathrop notwithstanding—that he who professes to be a citizen of the United States and a subject of Rome is an anomaly dangerous alike to the Republic and the Papacy.

W. J. H. Traynor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LIFE AT THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

BY THE REV. GODFREY SCHILLING, O. S. F.

MANY Americans have visited the Holy Sepulchre while travelling in Palestine, and tourists from all parts of the world yearly go over the sacred ground; but the writer enjoys the honor of having been the first citizen of the United States who took up his abode in that venerable edifice.

The Church of the Holy Sepulchre comprises within its walls the site of Calvary as well as the Tomb of our Saviour, as they are only about sixty feet distant from each other. The identity of these holy spots has of late been assailed from various quarters, but the very fact that every opponent of the traditional site has fixed his imaginary sanctuary on a different spot is enough to prove the emptiness of their assertions. Oriental and occidental tradition has always pointed to the one spot venerated by them all. It is not my purpose, however, to enter upon a discussion regarding the authenticity of the Holy Shrines, which is proven by an uninterrupted chain of witnesses which has never lost a link from the death of Christ to Hadrian, from Hadrian to St. Helena, from St. Helena to the Crusaders, and from their day until the present time. Believers in the Skull Hill and other new Calvarys and Holy Sepulchres are modest enough to suppose that the Christians and scientists of 1,800 years were all blind and misguided until these new theorists appeared. But, excepting a few curiosity seekers, nobody visits these new sites of Calvary and the Holy Sepulchre, and to-morrow we may hear of some other ones made to order to suit the latest ideas of some seeker of novelty and fame.

The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is situated at present within the walls of the city, in the northwestern part of Jerusalem. This fact is the chief stumbling-block of the opponents

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the traditional sanctuary, as Scripture tells us that the Saviour was crucified without the gate. The place of the crucifixion, however, was added to Jerusalem about the year A. D. 41 by Herod, and was surrounded by a wall. Recent excavations made by the Russians have brought to light foundations of the second wall, thus establishing the fact that the actual Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre lay without the walls although near to them.

On my first visit to the Holy Sepulchre I was surprised at the dilapidated condition of the Basilica, which certainly ought to be one of the most beautiful churches in the world, since it covers such precious ground. That it is not is due to the fact that the Turkish government owns it, and that not a nail can be driven into the walls without long negotiations with Pashas, Consuls, and Ambassadors. If it depended upon Catholics, I am sure their generosity would erect a temple worthy of the great mysteries fulfilled beneath its domes. But the *status quo* is strictly enforced, and the Oriental dissenting Christians of the Greek and Armenian rites, who look upon the Latins, their Western brethren, as intruders, jealously back up the Crescent and baffle every effort to make any repairs. An incident which happened only some twelve years ago will illustrate this fact. The mosaic flooring on the part of Calvary belonging to the Franciscans being considerably damaged and worn out, the Superior, who is called Custodian of the Holy Sepulchre, concluded to have it replaced by a new one, and for that purpose opened negotiations with the Greek Patriarch, conceding to the Greeks the repair of one of their sanctuaries. The conditions were mutually agreed upon, and the new marble flooring was ordered. When it was ready to be laid the Custodian notified the Greek Patriarch, who then withdrew his consent, as some counter-influence had been brought to bear upon him in the mean time. The flooring had therefore to be stored away for future use, and the question remained in abeyance.

The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is officiated by the Latins —as the Western Catholics are commonly called in the East—by the orthodox Greeks, and by the Armenians, all of whom have their respective habitations within the Basilica. The Latins are represented by the Franciscans, who have been guardians of the Holy Places since the year A. D. 1230, they having been officially designated and recognized as such by the Holy See. St. Francis, their founder, was himself a pilgrim to the Holy Land, and left

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

some of his disciples there, who afterwards became the successors of the Crusaders and established a province, which is still called the Custody of the Holy Land.

The history of the six centuries these poor Friars have spent in the guardianship of the Holy Shrines is written with bloody characters. By hundreds and thousands they have fallen a prey to Mahomedan persecution and to pestilence. But their ranks have always been filled by new volunteers coming from every country. Great is the work they have performed, but in their humility they have never paraded it before the world. They have kept alive the spark of Christian faith among the natives; they have worked for civilization among those benighted races who took pride in ignorance, establishing schools wherever it was possible, so that hardly an Arab can be found living within their jurisdiction who is not fairly well educated. They have also been a guide and a protection to the pilgrims who for centuries have flocked to Palestine. Even the Mahomedans could not help admiring their disinterested lives of sacrifice, as is proven by the firmans of various Sultans who recognized them officially as the representatives of Western Christianity, giving them permission to establish themselves and exhorting the Mahomedans not to molest them. They were known all over the East as the Friars of the Cord, the latter being the distinctive mark of the Franciscan order, and formerly no European was allowed to enter the Turkish dominions unless he wore either the costume of the country or the habit of these friars.

Life at the Holy Sepulchre is exceedingly interesting, both on account of the place itself and the many religious observances of the three officiating communities, and also with regard to the pilgrims and visitors.

The religious functions and ceremonies are of a unique character, combining the splendors of both the Eastern and Western churches. The sacred liturgy is celebrated daily at midnight by the three recognized communities, the Greeks officiating first. The Greeks have preserved the old oriental liturgical chant, which is similar to that of the Eastern nations. At first it is very disagreeable to a European ear, but when well executed is pleasing to those familiar with it. They make no use of the organ for accompaniment, as the instrument cannot well be adapted to the strange modulations of their voices. About one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

o'clock they begin their mass, and this ceremony varies in length and solemnity according to the feasts. The Patriarch and the bishops wear gorgeous vestments, and on these occasions use crowns instead of mitres. Nevertheless the Greek rite does not convey that dignified and devotional grandeur with which the Latin rite impresses the mind.

The Armenians celebrate after the Greeks. Their liturgy is more grave, the chant being uneven and mournful, and being accompanied by the sound of little bells attached to disks which are carried on long stems by acolytes. Church-bells are not in favor with them. They use instead, as in early times, a wooden or metallic plank, upon which they strike with hammers. The noise thus created is deafening and disagreeable.

Neither the Greek nor the Armenian church, both of which are represented at the Holy Sepulchre, is in union with the Catholic Church, although they do not differ widely in doctrine, or in regard to the Sacraments. The question which separates them from the Catholic Church is the supremacy of the Pope. They are under the immediate control of the Sultan, who practically elects and deposes their patriarchs. For this reason it is not always the worthiness of the candidate which decides whether or not he is to mount the Patriarchal chair and unworthy men are not infrequently enabled to thrust themselves into prominence, to the great detriment of their churches.

Both the Greeks and Armenians are hostile to the Catholic Church, being jealous of the rights and privileges that have from time to time been accorded to the latter by imperial firmans. Only by constant vigilance can the Latins elude their plans. Yet it often happens, especially at Bethlehem, that the Greeks or Armenians try a *coup d'etat*, and then violence has to be met with violence, as a *fait accompli* would only establish a new precedent. The Franciscans there have to be always ready to lay down their lives for the preservation of their rights, and only last September a brother who stood up for the rights of his church was killed in cold blood in the grotto of the Nativity. The Franciscans never act except in self-defence, and are never the aggressors, although European non-Catholic papers would make it appear to the contrary. An appeal to the Government is of no avail, for both the other parties, being Turkish subjects, have the sympathy of the authorities. The Latins

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have to present their claims through the French Consul, who generally adjusts matters by making concessions, knowing well enough that France is no longer in a position to prescribe conditions. Besides, these Consuls care very little about these religious affairs, a fact which once caused a high Turkish official at Constantinople to remark to the French Ambassador who was pleading such a question: "I am very much astonished that Your Excellency takes such great interest in the religious orders living in our country, since you have exiled them at home."

The life of the Franciscans at the Holy Sepulchre equals in austerity that of any other monastic institution. Their habitation is worse than that of the Trappists, because the latter have at least the commodities which the rule allows them; and it is worse than a hermitage, because it lacks both air and light. It is more of a prison than anything else, for the rooms can only be compared to dungeons, the one exit being through the door of the Basilica, which is closed except at certain times, and there is no window from which one can get a glimpse of the city or surrounding country, nor is there even a garden. The convent is a perfect labyrinth of stairways and tunnel-like corridors. The cells are so dark that a light is required during the day; and they are so damp that the walls are mouldy, water oozing from them continually. This is of course very unhealthy, and in consequence none of the Fathers is obliged to remain at the Holy Sepulchre longer than four or six months, when they are relieved and sent to another convent although some have remained there uninterruptedly for thirty years.

The cell I occupied was a little room, just large enough to contain my bed, a rough *prie-dieu,* a rickety chair, and a small table. A small square opening near the ceiling, giving out on the terrace, served for a window. The only object to be seen from there was the minaret of a Turkish mosque near by on which the Muezzin would appear at stated hours singing his call for prayer. The one place where we could breathe a little fresh air was on the terrace, a flat square on the roof walled in on every side, which has only existed since 1870, when the Emperor Francis Joseph obtained it from the Sublime Porte. It was formerly a stable, and, as may be imagined, the presence of the horses overhead used to keep the Fathers from sleeping, and disturb them at their devotions, besides endangering their lives, as they never

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

knew the moment the old building might collapse and bury them beneath it.

The day in the Holy Sepulchre begins at midnight when the Franciscans repair to the choir to say the matins, which last until about half-past one. After this they take a short rest and then say their masses. The greater part of the day is occupied by various offices and meditations. Their spare time is devoted to the spiritual wants of the pilgrims, to study, or to literary work. The meals are sent from the convent of St. Savior, which is about five minutes' walk from the Holy Sepulchre. When the Basilica is closed the food is passed in through an aperture in the main door.

Pilgrims who wish to pass a night at the Holy Sepulchre are provided for in the convent and can assist at the offices. Devout travellers gladly avail themselves of this privilege, and the Emperor Francis Joseph once passed the night with the fathers and shared their humble fare. A marble slab in the refectory reminds the visitor of this fact. A night spent at the Holy Sepulchre is one of the most impressive experiences of a lifetime. When the doors of the Basilica are closed, the visitor may wander at leisure through the silent halls of the temple, which, during Lent, are lit up by hundreds of lamps; the chapel of the Holy Sepulchre being adorned with a crown of lights glittering in all colors. Groups of Russian pilgrims may usually be heard intoning one of the soft and plaintive melodies peculiar to the Slavonic race. I always found that Calvary impressed the pilgrim more than the Holy Sepulchre. Yet the Sepulchre is the seal of veracity attached to the work of the redemption, and its authenticity would never have been recognized had Christ not arisen the third day, showing his superiority over death. Hence the veneration we hold for the Holy Sepulchre, and the pre-eminence of Easter Day over Good Friday.

The influx of pilgrims and tourists to Jerusalem has increased wonderfully within the last ten years. They come from every land and usually remain for Holy Week to witness the ceremonies at the Holy Sepulchre. The Franciscans have a pilgrim-house which is called Casa Nova, where they have always extended a cordial hospitality to visitors, regardless of creed or nationality. They have exercised this charity ever since their establishment in Palestine, and in many places, such as Nazareth, Mount Tabor,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Tiberias, their hospice is the only refuge where a traveller may find rest after a long journey on horseback. The records of these hospices show how highly the visitors have appreciated the kindness of the fathers, who do everything in their power to make strangers feel at home, without ever asking any compensation. At times, however, it has happened that some bigot has penned in a foreign language an insult to these kind hosts after having enjoyed their hospitality.

The French have organized an annual pilgrimage to Jerusalem, which generally takes place about Pentecost, and have built a special pilgrim-house called Notre Dame de France. The pilgrims, as a rule, remain about two weeks, and always create a great sensation. The shopkeepers, especially the venders of religious articles, await their coming with impatience, as they generally make large sales. Indeed the natives depend nearly entirely upon strangers for their livelihood, as otherwise Jerusalem has very little trade. The Germans and Austrians have also their pilgrim-houses in the Holy City. The Austrian house is situated on the Via Dolorosa, and has been honored by the presence of the Emperor, his unfortunate son Rudolph, and other members of the Imperial family. Spain organizes an occasional pilgrimage, and so does Italy. The first English Catholic pilgrimage took place in 1890, when, for the first time since the Crusades, the halls of the Basilica resounded with English hymns. It was headed by the Duke of Norfolk and the late Bishop Clifford. America had its pilgrimage in 1889. It was headed by the Very Rev. Charles A. Vissani, and numbered about 100 persons. A beautiful silk banner from the United States was deposited at the Holy Sepulchre and is displayed there on great festivals.

Russia sends the greatest contingent of pilgrims to the Holy Land. During Lent all the streets are crowded with them. These people, who mostly all belong to the lower classes, are clad in the heaviest garments and even the women wear large boots, which must be very cumbersome under the scorching sun of Palestine. They are not very scrupulous in regard to cleanliness, however, and for this reason the fathers who are compelled to mingle with them are often compelled to burn their clothes. They generally lead a very frugal life and visit all the holy places on foot, often walking for days at a time. Many of them never see their homes again, but find a resting-place in Palestine. Nearly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all of them buy their shrouds in Jerusalem. They generally leave on the Holy Saturday of the Greeks, immediately after witnessing the ceremony of the Holy Fire.

This function takes place yearly. It is pretended by the Greek clergy that the holy fire falls from heaven, and all Jerusalem turns out to see the spectacle. On the previous evening a great many Greeks from the neighboring villages assemble in the church and pass the night there, and at an early hour the Basilica is crowded with pilgrims. The excitement grows as the hour for the ceremony approaches, the Turkish troops being ordered out to prevent any disturbance. About one o'clock the Greek clergy form a procession around the Holy Sepulchre. Then the Greek Patriarch, together with the Armenian bishop and a few deacons, is locked in the chapel. Meanwhile the people outside, especially the peasants, shout and sing with wild enthusiasm. Every one attempts to get near the round opening in the wall, from which the holy fire is to be handed out. When the moment at last arrives and it is given to the people, every one lights his bunch of candles and in a moment the Basilica is ablaze with light. Riders on horseback are in waiting to bring the fire to Bethlehem, Lydda, Jaffa; and the pilgrims often carry it as far as Moscow and St. Petersburg.

One of the most incongruous sights at the Holy Sepulchre is the Turkish divan, just inside the entrance, on which a couple of indolent Moslems recline, gazing with apparent indifference at the devout pilgrims who pass through the gate, but really scrutinizing them with a view to soliciting *bakhsheesh*. These men may be styled the jailers of Christendom, for they possess the right of opening and closing the Basilica. This privilege has been hereditary in two families for centuries. To one of them belongs the right of keeping the key of the gate, and to the other one the privilege of opening it. When any one of the three communities living inside the Basilica desires the gate to be opened, a servant is signalled to call the representatives of the two families. After a long delay—because an Oriental is never in a hurry except when he wants a favor—the two men appear. The gate can be unlocked only in the presence of the two, the old regulations prescribing the attendance of both, as the one holding the key is not allowed to open the gate, and *vice versa*. After having performed their duty,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they repair to the divan, and proceed to light the *nargileh* and fan the brazier upon which they make their coffee. Charcoal and coffee have to be furnished them by the fathers besides a stipend of money, the price of all reaching about one dollar for each opening. The gate only remains open till about eleven o'clock in the forenoon. On festivals, when any of the Patriarchs make their solemn entrance, both wings of the gate are thrown open, and the price for this ranges from five to ten dollars, consuls and other distinguished visitors being expected to give extra *bakhsheesh*.

Despite all this servitude things have changed a great deal for the better since the Crimean War. Before that time these hereditary janitors exacted fabulous sums for opening the door, the consequence being that it often remained closed on the communities for months at a time. Pilgrims who could not pay the entrance fee were detained for six months or a year awaiting the arrival of some rich traveller who would pay their way into the Basilica, and many a one has returned to Europe without ever having seen the Tomb of our Lord, although he has stood before its gates. If any one of the fathers died, the gate had to be opened, and then the janitors levied another and higher tax on the poor friars, besides which a special permit for burial had to be obtained from the Government, which was generally given in the following terms: "We hereby allow a damned Frank dog to be buried." In order to avoid these vexations, many a father was buried in the cellar of the convent, within the Basilica, where the remains still repose, or more often the fathers resorted to a ruse to elude the vigilance and rapacity of the jailers. The corpse would be dressed up as usual in the habit, the hood being drawn low over the face, and two brothers, propping it up on either side, would lead it out through the gate early in the morning, as though they were taking the corpse out for a walk, whilst in reality they were conveying it to the burying ground.

These and worse humiliations the friars have had to suffer for six centuries. They were formerly strictly forbidden to build or make the slightest repairs without the written permission of the Cadi, which always involved such expense that they could not afford it. Such work had therefore to be done surreptitiously or by night, and they were obliged either to fill up the unoccupied rooms with the debris or to carry it out by degrees in their sleeves.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Turks compelled the friars to pay them at every opportunity. When drought prevailed or when rain fell too abundantly, when the locusts devoured the crops or pestilence broke out, when the Pasha's child took sick, the friars were charged. When the Cadi or Mufti chose to take another wife, the friars had to send him presents. The Pasha of Damascus made a visit to Jerusalem nearly every year, which filled the friars with new terror. Upon arriving he would send for the Superior, and tell him that being in financial straits he needed so many thousand dollars. The Superior would protest on his knees that he had not the required amount, whereupon the Pasha would hand him a purse, saying, "Well, in that case I will lend it to you," and then taking the money back would consider the friar as his debtor and charge him besides a heavy interest, for which he demanded a certified receipt. The amount of money which has been spent in such ways on the small convent of the Holy Sepulchre would suffice to have built the most gorgeous palace.

Owing to the confinement and continuous work at the Holy Sepulchre the fathers living there are often allowed to take occasional brief vacations which they usually spend among the various convents which are scattered through the neighboring country. These journeys are generally made on foot. While setting out on one of these holidays some years ago two of the Fathers, while walking along, were suddenly surrounded by a band of Bedouins, who took them prisoners. One of them managed to make his escape, but the other was carried off into the mountains of Moab, beyond the Dead Sea. Seeing that resistance would only aggravate his condition, he showed himself willing to assist his captors and thus ingratiated himself with them. In the course of time he mastered the Arabic language perfectly, was provided with an Arabic costume and came to be regarded as one of the tribe, but his longing to regain his liberty never lessened and finally grew so intense that he resolved to devise a plan of escape. An idea occurred to him one day and he decided upon its immediate undertaking, although it would take him years to put it into execution. During the various strifes in which the Bedouins were engaged he always remained at the camp, for they trusted him in everything excepting in matters of warfare, and he was never allowed to accompany them on their military excursions. After their next departure he repaired to a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

solitary ruin and taking a stone from the ancient building began to engrave an inscription thereon in Latin giving his history, imitating the old epigraphs he found there. As his tools were extremely poor the work progressed very slowly, and he was of course careful to bury the stone in the ground when the Bedouins returned. The Sheikh had often pressed him to tell where the hidden treasures of the ruined city were to be found, and when the inscription was completed the Friar took him to the spot where the stone was, pretending he had just discovered it, and telling him that it was worth its weight in gold on account of the inscription, and that it would be immediately purchased if presented at the convent of the Franciscans in Jerusalem. The Sheikh was at first incredulous, but his greed for money gained the upper hand, and he decided to take the stone along when next going to make purchases in the Holy City. In the fulness of time he presented himself and the stone to the Superior, who was startled at reading the message and hearing after fifteen years of the friar who had long been mourned as dead. The Sheikh, reading from his features that the value of the stone must be great, greatly rejoiced, and doubled in his mind the sum he was going to ask for it. The Superior told him that the stone had an immense value, but only if the person who discovered it could be produced, as everything depended upon the site where it was found and the circumstances attending its discovery. The Sheikh left in disgust and decided to let the matter drop, but his avarice again prevailed, and after some weeks he told the friar that he would have to prepare for a journey to Jerusalem, threatening him with death, however, if he would make known his identity. Upon their arrival at the convent they were shown into the reception-room, and treated to cigarettes and coffee. The Superior then asked to see the finder of the famous stone alone and retired with him into an adjoining room, from whence the long lost friar was immediately spirited away into the labyrinth of the convent. In the mean time the Superior had sent notice to the Pasha of the city, who promptly sent a detachment of soldiers to arrest the Bedouins, as they were all wanted for other offences.

GODFREY SCHILLING.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR FAMILY SKELETON.

BY CLARK HOWELL.

IF THE conclusions of Mr. John F. Hume, in his ghastly exhibition of the decaying remnants of "Our Family Skeleton," in the June issue of THE REVIEW, are correct, it follows that two things are true: First, that the credit of the States of the South is now below par, as compared with that of the States of other sections; and Second, that this condition, if properly stated, is the direct result of the past repudiation, by the States of the South, of large parts of their bonded indebtedness, which repudiation is the skeleton that Mr. Hume drags from the Southern closet, and flaunts in the eyes of capital as a menace to divert it from the channels of Southern investment. If, therefore, it can be demonstrated that the credit of the Southern States is not only as good, but better than that of some States which have no record of repudiation, and that, as a whole, the credit of the Southern States bears favorable comparison with that of the States of any other section of the Union, then it follows that "our family skeleton" of repudiation is no longer efficacious for the use to which Mr. Hume would put it, to wit: As a scarecrow to frighten capital from the field of Southern investment.

In the first place Mr. Hume does not correctly express the sentiment of the Southern States in his effort to make it appear that they are disinclined to a discussion of the question, and that "to many Southern people the subject is rather a delicate one." He deplores the fact that the Southern governors who recently conferred at Richmond, Va., for the purpose of calling attention to the advantages offered to capital in the development of Southern resources, omitted from their proceedings an inspection of the skeleton, and, excusing their reticence on the ground that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject was a tender one, he justifies his attack on Southern credit by the statement that he "does not feel bound to follow their example."

In the commendable work put on foot by the Southern governors at Richmond, the question of repudiated State bonds was not considered, because such discussion was not one of the purposes of the conference, not because the question was a distasteful one, but on account of the fact that the praiseworthy effort of the Southern governors to invite the attention of outside capital to the rich fields of undeveloped resources in the South, was based on abundant evidence that the disestablished credit of the South, resulting from the chaotic condition following the war, was thoroughly re-established, and that confidence in Southern securities was now regulated by the same conditions that controlled the estimate of the credit of any other section, the prime factor in which is the security of the obligations offered, not under past, but under existing conditions.

If, as Mr. Hume holds, it be true that the repudiation by the Southern States of bonds issued contrary to law, many of them admittedly illegal, unconstitutional, and worse than that, monstrously fraudulent, has injured the credit of the Southern States, this would, at once, become evident by public discredit of the securities issued since then, the value of which, according to Mr. Hume's theory, would be manifestly below that of the securities of States whose credit had not been injured by repudiation. And yet we find that Alabama five per cent. interest bonds are quoted in New York at from 100 to 105; Florida 6's at 127; Louisiana 4's at 98; North Carolina 6's at 127; South Carolina 4½'s at from 99 to 100; Tennessee (settlement) 5's at 105; and Georgia 4½'s at from 110 to 112. Among the States which have not repudiated, Connecticut 3½'s are quoted at 100; Maine 3's at from 97 to 99; Massachusetts 5's at 106½ to 107; Rhode Island 6's at 100.

There has not been an issue of Georgia bonds in the past ten years which was not readily disposed of in New York at terms strongly expressive of the good estimate that capital places on the credit of the State. As it is with Georgia, so it is with other Southern States, the credit of which, under the new order of things established with the reorganization of affairs after the reconstruction legislatures had sapped the vitality of every Southern

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

State, was soon readjusted to a normal basis, gaining strength year after year in proportion to the degree of recovery of the States from the rude shock of war.

Those who are not familiar with the facts cannot appreciate the condition in which the South was left after the war. With its assets halved, its debts more than trebled, commerce prostrated, and its social condition placed on a new basis, the burdens of the Southern States had in a few years increased in more than treble proportion to the decrease of their strength to bear them. Had conditions not been so materially changed by the war, I believe that the South would have cleared itself entirely of the record of repudiation by paying dollar for dollar even for the proceeds of the bonds which were unconstitutional and unauthorized, or by arriving at a satisfactory settlement with the bondholders, even had it become necessary to go to the extreme adopted by Minnesota of clearing its record of repudiation by a compromise settlement of 50 cents on the dollar. At the beginning of the war almost every Southern State had just about as heavy a load as it was possible to carry. But their obligations would have been satisfactorily disposed of in due time had not the war precipitated a condition which forced a different treatment of the question from that which would probably otherwise have been adopted. In this connection statistics throw valuable light on the strikingly disproportionate development in the tremendous decrease in the taxable basis of the South between 1860 and 1870, and the enormous increase in the bonded indebtedness of the same States during the same period, which was the era of germination and development of most of the repudiated bonds. The first of the following tables is taken from the valuable treatise on "Repudiation of State Debts," by Professor Scott, of the Chair of Political Economy of the University of Wisconsin, and the second from an article of Mr. R. P. Porter, in *The International Review:*

FALL IN TAXABLE BASIS OF THE SOUTHERN STATES.

	1860.	1870.	Per cent. of decrease.
Virginia	$657,021,336	$505,978,190	23
North Carolina	292,297,602	130,378,190	55.4
South Carolina	489,319,128	183,913,327	62.4
Georgia	618,232,387	227,219,519	63.2
Florida	68,929,685	32,480,843	52.9
Alabama	432,198,762	155,582,595	64
Mississippi	509,472,912	177,278,890	65.5
Louisiana	435,787,265	253,371,890	41.9
Arkansas	180,211,330	94,528,843	47.5
Tennessee	382,495,200	253,782,161	33.7

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INCREASE IN STATE DEBTS BETWEEN 1860 AND 1870 AND 1880.

	1860.	1870.	1880.	Highest point reached by debt.
Virginia	$31,779,062	$47,39[illegible],830	$29,345,238	$47,390,839
North Carolina	9,699,000	29,900,045	3,629,511	29,900,045
South Carolina	4,046,540	7,665,909	7,175,354	24,782,906
Georgia	2,670,750	6,544,500	10,334,000	20,197,500
Florida	4,120,000	1,288,697	1,391,357	5,512,268
Alabama	6,700,000	8,478,018	11,613,670	31,952,000
Mississippi	None	1,796,230	379,485	3,220,847
Louisiana	4,561,109	25,021,743	12,635,810	40,416,734
Arkansas	3,092,623	3,459,557	5,813,627	18,287,273
Tennessee	20,898,606	38,539,802	25,685,822	41,863,406

In the last of the above tables it will be observed that most of the State debts in 1880 show a vast increase over those of 1860, notwithstanding the fact that the figures given for 1880 are those left after the weeding out process of repudiation of unauthorized bonds. The last column in the above table represents the highest point reached by the debt of the States, including the bogus bonds, after the elimination of a large part of which the figures indicating the debts in 1880 remain.

It is not my purpose to enter into a discussion of the merits or demerits involved in the repudiation acts of the Southern States. Nor could I do so in the necessarily limited space of magazine discussion. The record of every State is made, and the action of each was the result of mature deliberation. For reasons satisfactory to the States themselves, and which have become a matter of history, a large part of the bonded indebtedness of these States was declared to be illegal, unauthorized, and unconstitutional, and and the States felt themselves justified in repudiating obligations to which they had been committed without due process of law, and by corrupt officials whose record of barter and sale of the credit of their respective States forms a part of the reconstruction history of the South. As for myself, I take the broad position that for every dollar borrowed in good faith on the legal credit of any State a dollar should be paid. Going further than this, I think the equities involved call for the settlement by the States of such bonded obligations as were taken in good faith, and the proceeds of which were clearly used for public purposes. But for such bonded indebtedness as was fixed on the Southern States by those who overturned both human and divine law to obtain authority which did not exist, and who used the good names and credit of the Southern States by which to obtain money which they poured like water down the channels of their riotous and unceasing demand for pillage and plunder, I do not think that either equity,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

justice, or law should require payment by the States which were so palpably robbed, and which, generally speaking, did not even receive the benefit resulting from the proceeds of the bonds to which their names were so mercilessly pledged.

In his treatise on "The Laws of Public Securities," p. 5, a well-known authority on the subject (Burroughs) says:

"All who deal with a public agent or officer must take notice of his powers. He derives his authority from the law which authorizes his appointment. No person may profess ignorance of the extent of the powers of a public agent."

This is a broad principle of law which not only justified the States of the South in refusing to meet obligations which did not belong to them, but which also prevents such action from menacing the good standing of their credit, for, under the new conditions established with the reorganization of internal affairs after the South had obtained possession of itself, a basis of credit was established from which it would be as reasonable to say that the Southern States would depart as it would be to charge that Pennsylvania, Michigan, Wisconsin, or Minnesota would repudiate their obligations of to-day because they had done so in the past.

I quote from Mr. Hume's article, in which, after dwelling upon the fact that the development of the South has been materially retarded by its lack of credit, and by the fear of capital in entering a territory in which the repudiation "skeleton" stalks, the following:

"Georgia is the South's recognized leader in wealth and enterprise, but most of Georgia's railroads are in receivers' hands. It is not so much that outside capital avoids the South. There is plenty of it seeking her coal, iron, and timber lands, and even millions have disappeared in her luckless 'boomer' cities and towns. Why is it, then, that when we come to their railroads, their stocks are shunned by investors, and even their mortgage securities go at murderous discounts? Is it not because, being quasi-public institutions, operating under State legislation and supervision, they share to a considerable extent the discredit of their legal masters and sponsors?"

After this Mr. Hume proceeds to show that not only all the railroads, but corporations generally, including the counties and towns of the South, "are more or less sufferers in the same way." It is a pity that in a charge so grave the author should content himself with a mere statement, without giving either facts or figures to sustain it. Instead of the conditions being correctly stated, the exact reverse of the situation described by Mr. Hume is true. Neither the cities nor the counties of the South are any greater sufferers from lack of credit than the counties or the cities

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of any other section of the country. On the contrary, the credit of the city of Atlanta is gilt-edged, and during the past decade she has not issued a bond which has not been promptly taken at an exceedingly low rate of interest. So it is with all of the leading Southern cities, where the restrictions of the law have been clearly complied with in the use of their credit.

As to the Southern railroads being involved in receivership complications as the result of the repudiation acts of Southern States, the conclusion is too far-fetched to invoke serious consideration. Suffice it to say that some of the greatest railroad systems in the United States and Canada are now in the hands of receivers, and there is not a State in the Union whose railroad mileage is not seriously involved in receivership litigation as the result of precisely the same conditions that have led to the appointment of receivers for some Southern roads. A most notable instance is that of the vast system of the Union Pacific Railroad, and even the fact that the government, itself, was its sponsor was not sufficient to keep it out of receivership coils. I have not the statistics before me, but the probability is that they will show that not less than three-fourths of the railroad mileage of the United States is now in the hands of the courts, and being administered by receivers. Even in States with such unquestioned credit as New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, the New York & New England Railroad has recently joined the receivership procession, in which it marches side by side with some of the greatest railroad systems of the New England, Middle, Western, and Pacific States.

And yet the great financial firm of Drexel, Morgan & Co., one of the strongest banking institutions on earth, did not stop to decry the credit of the Southern States when it signified its willingness to undertake the reorganization of the East Tennessee, Virginia & Georgia and the Richmond & Danville systems, which traverse the States of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

It is a fact not generally known that an Attorney-General of New York delivered an opinion in which he stated, officially, that, after a careful investigation of the facts, he saw nothing that should in any wise impair the credit of the State of Georgia. I refer to the decision of Attorney-General O'Brien, which was extensively circulated when rendered, and which was given as the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

result of a call for his construction of a statute of New York, to ascertain whether that statute would permit savings banks in New York to invest in an issue of three and a half millions of Georgia bonds, sold at a premium in 1885 to well known New York financiers. The statute referred to allowed "savings banks to invest in the stocks and bonds of any State that has not within ten years defaulted in the payment of principal or interest on any debt authorized by any legislature to be contracted." The petitioners, being the purchasers, were represented by Hon. N. J. Hammond and Mr. Pat Calhoun, of Atlanta, who were opposed by the holders of the repudiated bonds of the State of Georgia, whose counsel were Mr. Hutchins, Receiver of the American National Bank, of New York, and an ex-Member of Congress from that State, and ex-Chief Justice Lochrane, of the Supreme Court of Georgia. Counsel for the petitioners admitted that Georgia had not paid the interest on the repudiated bonds, but contended that because they were unconstitutional issues, they were not in any fair sense a "debt authorized by any legislature to be contracted." After a full investigation of the merits of the case, Attorney-General O'Brien rendered a decision, in which he took the position that most of the repudiated bonds of the State of Georgia had been issued unconstitutionally. Still he thought that a certain very small portion held by certain parties ought, under the circumstances, to be paid on the doctrine of estoppel, said parties having purchased certain bonds after a resolution of the General Assembly of Georgia recognizing their validity. The Attorney-General thought that under the law of New York the question of unconstitutionality could not probably be considered, though under a technicality savings banks could not invest in the bonds. He took pains to say that there was nothing in the investigation which should, in the slightest degree, impair the credit of the State, and this decision, and particularly the last statement referred to, was complained of severely at the time by those who were seeking to discredit the State, they charging that it was a voluntary indorsement of the State of Georgia, which the Attorney-General of the State of New York went out of his way to give.

As for development, railroad and otherwise, the answer of Georgia and other Southern States completely refutes the argument and annihilates the conclusion that repudiation has reduced

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

credit, and reduced credit has retarded development. Proof of the fact that more outside capital has sought investment in the development of Georgia than in probably any other State of the Union of the same population, in the past fifteen years, is absolute proof of the unsoundness of Mr. Hume's charge that withered resources awaiting development are the indirect result of the repudiation by the State of unauthorized debts.

For the past ten or fifteen years the record of railroad-building in the United States shows that Georgia has led, almost every year, in the mileage of new roads. Taken as a whole during that time the mileage of new railroads built in Georgia by far surpasses that of any other State in the Union. Most of the capital put in such development has come from the outside, and the repudiation "skeleton" had no terror for it. Some of the greatest railroad systems in the United States have pushed their lines into and through Georgia, and the remarkable advance made in the railroad development of the State has been but the index of that which has kept pace in the improvement of other resources. As it has been with Georgia so it has been with other Southern States, the railroad and general development of the South Atlantic and Gulf States having been more marked for the same period of time than that of any section of the country. Millions upon millions of dollars—most of it outside capital—have been invested in unlocking the mineral resources of Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to a greater degree than in any other territory of the same area, have the untold iron, coal, mineral, marble, and hard-wood industries of these States responded to the quickening touch of outside capital.

In Florida, which Mr. Hume says "is responsible for four or five millions more" of repudiated bonds, and the development of which from the demoralization of repudiation, if Mr. Hume's argument be true, would be seriously retarded by the loss of credit incident to repudiation, we find the most remarkable evidence of the recent work of outside capital to be found probably in any State in the Union. Eminent Northern capitalists, ranking among the greatest financiers of the country, are there vying with one another in the apparent effort to see which can put the most money in transforming that beautiful land of sunshine into the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

garden spot of the continent. Untold millions of Northern capital have been expended in building vast railroad systems, establishing steamship lines, constructing the most beautiful hotels on earth, and in otherwise adding to the marvellous gifts which nature had bestowed upon the state of perpetual summer. Neither Mr. Plant, nor Mr. Flagler, nor Mr. Disston, nor Mr. Duval has stopped to inquire into the issues involved in Florida's repudiated obligations, nor has the credit of the State been lessened one whit by such repudiation. The men who are spending their money there in such abundance that it is impossible to keep up with the details of the progress of the State, have satisfied themselves that the past is a matter of record, and that the present is an open book of brilliant promise for Florida's future. Whatever may have been the conditions leading to repudiation, they do not exist to-day, nor can they exist again under the wise restrictions of the reorganized fundamental law of the State, which, as other States have done, has thrown every possible safeguard around its credit, rendering it, like that of every other Southern State, as secure as that of any State in the Union.

In this connection, it may be well to call attention to the fact that the power of the States of the South to contract debts was, before the war, practically unlimited, as compared with the restrictions placed by the States upon themselves after the war. The necessity of this limitation was evolved from the dear experience bought from reconstruction legislatures, which would have broken the Bank of England if they had had the same opportunity to trifle with its credit that they did with that of the States, which their usurped charge came near bankrupting. The fundamental law of most of the Southern States, like that of a large majority of all the States of the Union, now inhibits State indorsement of corporation securities—a fruitful source of corruption and plunder before the war, and particularly during the reconstruction era—and forbids the use of the State's credit for any other than administrative, educational, or other such emergent purposes. I am aware that a favorite argument of those who hold the States responsible for all repudiated obligations, even though admitted to be unconstitutional, fraudulent, and unused for State purposes, is that innocent holders of the State obligations should not be made to suffer the penalty of the misuse of the State's credit. And yet to hold the State responsible for an obligation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the making of which it had given no authority whatsoever, would be to put a premium on corruption which would, if such a principle held good in law, imperil the credit of even the strongest and richest of the States of the Union. Carrying this argument to its logical conclusion would force the United States to redeem every dollar of counterfeit money in the hands of innocent holders, on the ground that they accepted the money on their faith that the government was back of it and was responsible for it.

The government itself established the precedent that the innocence of the bondholder was not to be considered as overcoming the illegality of the issue of securities held, in the adoption of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which compelled the repudiation of debts contracted either for direct or indirect aid of the rebellion. Millions of dollars of bonded indebtedness of the Southern States were thus repudiated by the Federal Government itself after the war. Nor were the debts so repudiated incurred directly in aid of the rebellion, though they were placed, constructively, in that category. Vast amounts of money were raised on bonds by Southern States, not in aid of the Confederacy, but for the absolute protection of life against the ravages of destitution and starvation. It is not strange, therefore, that under the peculiar conditions existing at the time, the line of demarcation between such obligations as the Southern States were forced to dishonor, and others which they did dishonor for reasons fully as satisfactory to themselves, was necessarily vague.

The conditions of the South before the war and after the war widely differed. A new order of things grew out of the ashes of the fires left by the Northern armies. The change was even greater than that in which the new republic found itself when the Colonial armies cut the United States from English territory. Then the same homogeneous people, fresh from the strife of war, turned to the vocations which they left when they went to the field of battle, and devoted their energies with renewed enthusiasm to the upbuilding of industry and commerce on the same lines that they had pursued before. How different with the South in '65! A new era of industrial development and commercial possibilities dawned with the freedom of slave labor, by which the attention of the South had been confined almost entirely, most unfortunately, to agricultural pursuits. Tax valuations had been cut in half, and when the South finally awoke to a real-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ization of the fact that it was in the possession of its own people once more, it was astonished to find that its overwhelming burden of new indebtedness had increased in thrice the proportion of the decrease of its ability to pay. Irresponsible, corrupt, and despotic officials had gotten hold of the ledger of its credit, and had stamped debt, debt, debt on every page. No people under the sun ever faced such a task. The lack of limitation on the credit of the State, which had been safely guarded and protected by the conservatism and the honor of the people, had been taken advantage of by a horde of cormorant dervishes who, if they had been permitted to continue their mad carousal, would have placed a greater debt on the Southern States than could have been met by the combined nations of Europe. Yet such were the instruments chosen, amid such surroundings, to absolve the Southern States, by virtue of the Fourteenth Constitutional Amendment, from certain portions of their bonded indebtedness. Thus directed by the government to reorganize the fundamental law of the Southern States, they paid more attention to the details of making robbery easy than to the special work of repudiation assigned to them.

On regaining possession of their capitals, and resuming the administration of affairs, the people of the respective Southern States addressed themselves at once with becoming energy to the work of restoration and rehabilitation, and to the more important task of establishing laws and regulations to meet the requirements of the new order of things. This great task they soon performed, and so wisely did they execute it that the credit established by the Southern States on the new basis, and under the new era of their progress, was at once put on a firm foundation, which has been strengthened year after year by the never-failing test of experience. It will not do for Mr. Hume to point to ancient evidences of dishonored and unauthorized debts which are being hawked about the stock market of New York, at a few cents on the dollar, to establish his charge that the credit of the Southern States has been seriously impaired by such repudiation. The only demonstration of the correctness of his proposition would be the failure of the Southern States to negotiate loans on their credit, under reasonable terms, during a comparatively recent period. Instead of this being true, the record of daily stock market quotations shows that the obligations of the Southern States since

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

they have fully gained possession of themselves and have adjusted their laws to meet the new conditions growing out of the war, float side by side, and under essentially the same terms, with those of the States of every other part of our common country. Since it has been demonstrated, therefore, that the credit of the States of the South is not now at the low ebb Mr. Hume argues it to be, and since it is clearly demonstrated that their credit compares favorably with the States of other sections which have no record of repudiation, and since these two propositions form the premise of Mr. Hume's doleful conclusion of the direct result of past repudiation, it follows that, being wrong in his premise, his conclusion is equally erroneous. Nor is it demonstrated that this conclusion is wrong, on the principle that his premise is incorrect, for the actual evidence of statistics and of financial records, corroborated by the daily details of the unprecedented development of the resources of the Southern States, by the influx of outside capital, proves both his premise and his conclusions to be false.

Notwithstanding the fact that the affairs of the South have become thoroughly adjusted to prevailing conditions, and that the credit of every Southern State is thoroughly established, I would not be understood as taking the position that they should even now refuse to pay a single dollar which can be shown to have been used honestly for public purposes, and for which the State got value received, even though such a loan did not conform strictly to the technical requirements of the law. If it can be satisfactorily demonstrated that among the repudiated bonds of the Southern States there is any part of them which represents money obtained for the State, and used by the State, which has not yet been paid, then the settlement of such should, and will be, made in due time. It was necessary to apply a heroic remedy to save the South, by cutting from it the sores of the reconstruction thievery. If in applying the remedy injustice was done, in the necessity for immediate and incisive action, correction will no doubt be made wherever conservative sentiment is convinced that correction is due.

CLARK HOWELL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HOW TO PROTECT A CITY FROM CRIME.

BY THOMAS BYRNES, SUPERINTENDENT OF THE NEW YORK POLICE DEPARTMENT.

A DISCUSSION in the public prints of the ways and means of preventing crime is not altogether free from danger. For one of the most important of these is the preservation of absolute secrecy on the part of the men whose business it is to protect the people and their property from criminals. To expose therefore in detail the methods of the police would be impracticable here. It would do no good and it might do considerable harm. The best that can be done in an article of this character is to deal with the subject in its larger aspects.

In the first place, it is now pretty generally understood that crime is greater in the larger cities than elsewhere. This is due, not merely to the fact that where a great number of people are gathered there is sure to be a larger number of criminals than where the community is less extensive, but to the attractions that large cities offer to those who live by preying upon their fellow-beings. In other words, criminals find more opportunities for the profitable exercise of their wits in the great centres; besides, they can elude detection more easily there. Consequently, it is of the greatest importance that the utmost vigilance be used to protect these places.

Not many years ago, New York city was infested with criminals of all kinds. It was impossible to walk along the streets without rubbing up against them; indeed, they were so numerous that they actually elbowed respectable people off the sidewalk. They consorted with politicians of a low order and with gamblers and the like, and they enjoyed such immunity from punishment that they developed a really amazing effrontery. It was felt that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

radical measures must be taken to root them out and to protect the city against them. So radical measures were taken; in a comparatively short space of time every one of these men was summoned to Police Headquarters and ordered to leave town and to keep away. They all left and most of them have kept away; those who returned have had occasion to regret it. Such measures may seem harsh and unjust; it may be thought cruel to arrest men on no specific charge and drive them from their place of residence. But the police knew what they were about when they did this; they knew that these men were professional criminals, that their very presence in a city was a menace to its safety. At any rate, the proceedings caused New York to cease to be a hotbed of criminality, and transformed it into a place where self-respecting people could live without fear of public danger.

New York, however, has, of course, still to be protected with the utmost vigilance. Just as criminals flock to cities, so it is their tendency to flock in largest numbers to the largest city in the country. Consequently, New York is the place in which not only those in this country, but those who come here from abroad, would naturally like to congregate. When we consider the vast number of inlets and outlets that New York has—more than any other American city—the problem, how to keep it vigilantly guarded, is seen to be one of extraordinary difficulty.

For example, a foreign criminal flees to this country. He lands in New York, absolutely untrammelled, as free as the most law-abiding citizen in the land. If he were in Europe, he would be marked as a ticket-of-leave man, or he would be known to the police there, for the European police are very watchful; or he would be checked by the passport system. But once on American soil, in New York city, is lost among two millions of people, and practically begins a new life. If he continues to lead a criminal life, he has possibly an added advantage over the police by following foreign methods of crime, with which they may not be familiar.

Within the past few years Europe has sent to us the most dangerous kind of criminal that exists at the present time—the Anarchist. It would surprise the American public very greatly if the number of Anarchists now in this country were published. When these men are hounded from their own lands they seem to gravitate here by a natural attraction, and most of them display

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fondness for taking up residence in New York city. To the police they present a peculiarly difficult problem, for they do not belong to the usual type of criminal and, as a rule, they are far superior in intelligence and education to most of the members of the criminal classes. Moreover, they use the most terrible forces of nature, forces that the ordinary criminal would not think of using. Among those I have talked with—and I have had very intimate relations with a great many of them—I have observed a religious, perhaps I would better say a fanatical, spirit. They have dedicated themselves heart and soul to their peculiar beliefs; and they, that is, the leaders among them, stop at nothing, not even death itself, in their efforts to put these beliefs into practice in terrorizing the community. I make particular mention of their "leaders," for, as a matter of fact, only about one in ten of the Anarchists is really active; the others merely follow the guidance of the more daring spirits. It would be a mistake to suppose that when they leave the monarchical countries and come here they do not carry their revolutionary principles with them. They are opposed not merely to old forms of government, but to all government as we understand the term, and they would gladly destroy our republican government if they had an opportunity to do so. On arriving here, however, they find the authorities ready to meet them, and thus far they have been held well in check. In New York an incessant watch is kept upon them, and any move that they might make hostile to the well-being of the citizens would bring against them the full power of the law.

All this will serve to suggest a few of the difficulties which beset those whose duty it is to protect from crime a city like New York. These difficulties are enormous, but I believe that they can be overcome. The burden of the work rests, of course, upon the police, upon their alertness, their efficiency, and their discipline. It is upon their discipline that I lay the greatest stress; to do their work efficiently it is essential that they be thoroughly organized and under perfect control. Each policeman is assigned to a certain district, and on him the people in the district rely for protection. Now this protection does not consist merely in the arresting of those who attempt to commit crime or who have committed it; on the contrary, this is only a secondary part of their work. Their most important duty consists of *preventing* all attempts at crime. This, of course, can be done only by the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exercise of the most unremitting vigilance. In the first place, each policeman must make himself thoroughly acquainted with everything concerning his district; he must know the people and their habits; he must find out, among other things, who those are that habitually remain away from home till late at night, or who appear on the streets early in the morning. The honest men who are obliged by their work to do this have no occasion to fear such vigilance, for, far from being an impertinent interference in their business, it is a protection to them. As a matter of fact, only those need fear the intrusions of the police who have themselves something criminal to conceal. On the incessant watching of each district by the policeman in charge of it, rests the entire protection of the citizens of a city. In my experience, I have found the exchanging of policemen from one district to another at intervals advantageous; it broadens the man, removes him from any possible breaches of duty that might result from too close a familiarity with one district and one set of people, and is in every way beneficial to him in the exercise of his duty.

But, of course, no policemen, however vigilant they may be, are able to cope with all the crime in a great city. A keen-witted and conscientious detective force must co-operate with them. Such a region as Wall street, for example, possesses very great attractions to clever criminals in all great cities. It is important, therefore, that unusual methods be tried to protect it. Until within recent years, no less than eleven millions of dollars were stolen in Wall street. But since extraordinary efforts were made to prevent further stealing there, by the use of the detective force, the robberies have ceased. This illustrates the importance of a thorough detective service; no city should neglect to keep this service up to the very highest standard.

One point of great importance in dealing with criminals is this: they must be kept as much as possible apart; they must be prevented from organizing, and, if they are organized, the organization must be broken up. To accomplish this, the greatest skill is necessary; they must be met on their own ground and beaten at every one of their games. No quarter should be shown them; they should be made to feel that the heel of the law is upon them and that they are mere dust beneath it. In other words, they should be taught that they are utterly insignificant and that the law has them completely in its power. In this way

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

alone, I believe, can they be successfully dealt with. My experience has taught me to look upon criminality and criminals in a wholly practical way. I have no sympathy with those who regard the matter from the sentimental point of view, and who maintain that criminals, instead of being punished, should be won over to right living by love and kindness.

Before touching upon this subject, however, I want to make clear just what I mean by criminals. I distinguish between those who yield to temptation and commit one crime, and those who repeatedly commit crimes—those whom we know as "professional" or hardened criminals. With regard to the first class, I can say that they often deserve to be treated with leniency, for in this way they may be saved from ruin and from criminal lives; but with regard to the second class, I am of the opinion that it is impossible to reform them. They are sent to prison, not merely to be punished, but to serve as a warning to others; that is, their punishment is given chiefly as a preventive of other crime. When once a man serves a term in prison, I have very little hope for him; for while there he lives in a criminal atmosphere, he comes in contact with other prisoners, who talk to him about their crimes, and who teach him new ways of committing crime; so that he leaves the place more tainted than he was when he went into it. Yet I do not mean by this to cast a reproach upon any of our prisons. Our prison system is by no means ideal, but it is the best that has been devised so far, and prisons are necessary evils. The great danger from them, as I have already intimated, comes from the intermingling of the inmates. But this cannot be helped. Prisoners are human beings and therefore gregarious; if they were kept constantly in solitary confinement they would simply become mad.

As for the sentimental treatment of prisoners, I have, for many years, observed its workings very carefully, and I am convinced that it does them neither good nor harm. Those ladies who present prisoners with flowers are no doubt very kind-hearted and very well-intentioned; but their labors are wasted. The prisoners like to receive their visits, for they afford diversions to many monotonous lives; but when they go away, they are ridiculed by the very ones on whom they have spent their time and showered their gifts. Some of these ladies are given nick-names by the prisoners, who frequently refer to them by these names.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This will, perhaps, illustrate as well as anything else the way in which the prisoners regard them.

Those people who look at criminality from the sentimental point of view apparently do not realize that with hardened criminals it becomes a business, which they pursue very much as normal human beings pursue theirs. Indeed, from the psychological point of view, the criminal is a most interesting study: he is depraved, suspicious, and absolutely without honor; the proverb about "honor among thieves" has no foundation in truth. It should be borne in mind that the criminal class, though apparently exceedingly numerous, makes altogether only a very small proportion of the total population. The more people become educated, the fewer criminals there are. By this I do not mean that education of itself necessarily promotes morality, for I have known well-educated men, of good birth, too, who have been thoroughly dishonest and corrupt: but simply that the more intelligent a man becomes the more plainly he sees the risk he runs in committing a crime. The average criminal is utterly reckless; he does not stop to consider what will happen to him if he is caught in his law-breaking. As soon as he does stop to consider what the consequences of a crime that he thinks of committing will be, he shows that there are possibilities in him of becoming a law-abiding citizen. So it follows that one of the best ways of protecting a community from crime is by raising the standard of intelligence among its members.

A good deal is said nowadays about the causes of crime and about crime as a hereditary disease. I have observed that most of the crime committed in New York city is due chiefly to two causes, drink and environment. The first cause needs no explanation; perhaps the second does, as I wish to emphasize the distinction between heredity and enviromnent. I have seen men so corrupt that it has seemed to me as if a tendency to commit crime must be in their blood; but, on the whole, I do not put much faith in the theory that criminals are born with an irresistible tendency to evil-doing. I know, however, that the children of criminals are very apt to become criminals themselves. As a rule, criminals try to conceal the character of their lives from their children; but when one of the parents disappears from home for three or four years at a time and when the home is the resort of other criminals, the children are always sharp

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enough to see just how things stand and so they fall very naturally into vicious ways. In a great city it is supposed that poverty is also the cause of much of the criminality; but this is not the fact; such crime as it does cause is comparatively slight.

There is another great evil abounding in large cities that has puzzled good thinking men for hundreds of years—the social evil. In my work I have naturally had occasion to study this question, and I have come to the conclusion that it is the most baffling of all the kinds of crime with which the law has to deal; indeed, so baffling that I believe it cannot be exterminated. There are those who maintain that it ought to be regulated by the authorities, that it should be confined to a certain district in the city; but I do not agree with these theories. In my opinion it should be kept as far from the public view as possible; if it were relegated to any particular quarter in a city, it would simply create a plague spot, a marked place, which would thus be given a dangerous publicity and made a blot upon the community. These people who indulge in sensational crusades against the social evil take a fearful responsibility upon themselves, and, far from accomplishing any good, they do an untold amount of harm. In the first place, they are inexperienced; all they know about crime and criminals is purely theoretical. Many of them, moreover, are nothing less than fanatics. They drive the degraded from their own haunts and force them to hide among respectable people, where they are far more harmful than they were before, because they have greater opportunities to spread vice. Moreover, they cause to be disseminated in the public prints the most shameful accounts of vice, which cannot fail to do a great amount of injury. Tampering with the social evil is a very ticklish game. The more the public hears about it, the worse for the public. It is the business of the law and of the police, who are supposed to aid in the carrying out of the law, to protect the public; in my judgment, therefore, the police in their efforts to eradicate this crime must take particular care to keep it as far from public notice as possible.

On the whole, I believe that during the past twenty-five years a very distinct advance has been made in the protection of cities against crime. The law is more effectually enforced than it ever has been before, and the methods of prevention and detection have become much more skilful and effective. Extradition

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treaties have now been made by the United States with nearly all the other countries in the world, and it is therefore most difficult for a criminal to elude justice. It must be confessed that under our system of government any system of police must be more or less handicapped. For example, in European countries, a criminal may be arrested and held by the authorities for a time in secret. In this country, however, such a course of procedure would be impossible. A prisoner is brought into court the very day of his arrest or the day after. This method of dealing with those who are accused of criminality has its advantage for the accused, and there is, of course, a measure of justice in it; but, on the other hand, it often handicaps the police in the detection of crime and of its perpetrators, for secrecy is an important element in this work.

The publicity given to crime by our newspapers is also a frequent obstacle to the detection of it; yet the papers, of course, render an incalculable amount of assistance in the ferreting out of malefactors in a great many cases. Publication is a warning to criminals; but it is, besides, an appeal to the country for aid in detecting them. As soon as a criminal's description is given in the newspapers, thousands of people are on the watch for him. Consequently, at the present time, the means of detection of crime and of bringing its perpetrators to justice are remarkable. But, as I have already pointed out, detection is only a secondary consideration; those improvements in the police system are most important which are in the direction of *preventing* crime; and the more our reformers work in this direction the more practical will the results of their efforts be and the more beneficial to the community.

THOMAS BYRNES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN DEFENCE OF HARRIET SHELLEY.—I.

BY MARK TWAIN.

I HAVE committed sins, of course; but I have not committed enough of them to entitle me to the punishment of reduction to the bread and water of ordinary literature during six years when I might have been living on the fat diet spread for the righteous in Professor Dowden's Life of Shelley, if I had been justly dealt with.

During these six years I have been living a life of peaceful ignorance. I was not aware that Shelley's first wife was unfaithful to him and that that was why he deserted her and wiped the stain from his sensitive honor by entering into soiled relations with Godwin's young daughter. This was all new to me when I heard it lately and was told that the proofs of it were in this book, and that this book's verdict is accepted in the girls' colleges of America and its view taught in their literary classes.

In each of these six years multitudes of young people in our country have arrived at the Shelley-reading age. Are these six multitudes unacquainted with this life of Shelley? Perhaps they are; indeed one may feel pretty sure that the great bulk of them are. To these, then, I address myself, in the hope that some account of this romantic historical fable and the fabulist's manner of constructing and adorning it may interest them.

First, as to its literary style. Our negroes in America have several ways of entertaining themselves which are not found among the whites anywhere. Among these inventions of theirs is one which is particularly popular with them. It is a competition in elegant deportment. They hire a hall and bank the spectators' seats in rising tiers along the two sides, leaving all the middle stretch of the floor free. A cake is provided as a prize for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

winner in the competition, and a bench of experts in deportment is appointed to award it. Sometimes there are as many as fifty contestants, male and female, and five hundred spectators. One at a time the contestants enter, clothed regardless of expense in what each considers the perfection of style and taste, and walk down the vacant central space and back again with that multitude of critical eyes on them. All that the competitor knows of fine airs and graces he throws into his carriage, all that he knows of seductive expression he throws into his countenance. He may use all the helps he can devise: watch-chain to twirl with his fingers, cane to do graceful things with, snowy handkerchief to flourish and get artful effects out of, shiny new stovepipe hat to assist in his courtly bows; and the colored lady may have a fan to work up *her* effects with, and smile over and blush behind, and she may add other helps, according to her judgment. When the review by individual detail is over, a grand review of all the contestants in procession follows, with all the airs and graces and all the bowings and smirkings on exhibition at once, and this enables the bench of experts to make the necessary comparisons and arrive at a verdict. The successful competitor gets the prize which I have before mentioned, and an abundance of applause and envy along with it. The negroes have a name for this grave deportment-tournament; a name taken from the prize contended for. They call it a Cake-Walk.

This Shelley biography is a literary cake-walk. The ordinary forms of speech are absent from it. All the pages, all the paragraphs, walk by sedately, elegantly, not to say mincingly, in their Sunday-best, shiny and sleek, perfumed, and with *boutonnières* in their buttonholes; it is rare to find even a chance sentence that has forgotten to dress. If the book wishes to tell us that Mary Godwin, child of sixteen, had known afflictions, the fact saunters forth in this nobby outfit: "Mary was herself not unlearned in the lore of pain"—meaning by that that she had not always travelled on asphalt; or, as some authorities would frame it, that she had "been there herself," a form which, while preferable to the book's form, is still not to be recommended. If the book wishes to tell us that Harriet Shelley hired a wet-nurse, that commonplace fact gets turned into a dancing-master, who does his professional bow before us in pumps and knee-breeches, with his fiddle under one arm and his crush-hat under the other, thus:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The beauty of Harriet's motherly relation to her babe was marred in Shelley's eyes by the introduction into his house of a hireling nurse to whom was delegated the mother's tenderest office."

This is perhaps the strangest book that has seen the light since Frankenstein. Indeed it is a Frankenstein itself; a Frankenstein with the original infirmity supplemented by a new one; a Frankenstein with the reasoning faculty wanting. Yet it believes it can reason, and is always trying. It is not content to leave a mountain of fact standing in the clear sunshine, where the simplest reader can perceive its form, its details, and its relation to the rest of the landscape, but thinks it must help him examine it and understand it; so its drifting mind settles upon it with that intent, but always with one and the same result: there is a change of temperature and the mountain is hid in a fog. Every time it sets up a premise and starts to reason from it, there is a surprise in store for the reader. It is strangely near-sighted, cross-eyed, and purblind. Sometimes when a mastodon walks across the field of its vision it takes it for a rat; at other times it does not see it at all.

The materials of this biographical fable are facts, rumors, and poetry. They are connected together and harmonized by the help of suggestion, conjecture, innuendo, perversion, and semi-suppression.

The fable has a distinct object in view, but this object is not acknowledged in set words. Percy Bysshe Shelley has done something which in the case of other men is called a grave crime; it must be shown that in his case it is not that, because he does not think as other men do about these things.

Ought not that to be enough, if the fabulist is serious? Having proved that a crime is not a crime, was it worth while to go on and fasten the responsibility of a crime which was not a crime upon somebody else? What is the use of hunting down and holding to bitter account people who are responsible for other people's innocent acts?

Still, the fabulist thinks it a good idea to do that. In his view Shelley's first wife, Harriet, free of all offence as far as we have historical facts for guidance, must be held unforgivably responsible for her husband's innocent act in deserting her and taking up with another woman.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Any one will suspect that this task has its difficulties. Anyone will divine that nice work is necessary here, cautious work, wily work, and that there is entertainment to be had in watching the magician do it. There is indeed entertainment in watching him. He arranges his facts, his rumors, and his poems on his table in full view of the house, and shows you that everything is there—no deception, everything fair and aboveboard. And this is apparently true, yet there is a defect, for some of his best stock is hid in an appendix-basket behind the door, and you do not come upon it until the exhibition is over and the enchantment of your mind accomplished—as the magician thinks.

There is an insistent atmosphere of candor and fairness about this book which is engaging at first, then a little burdensome, then a trifle fatiguing, then progressively suspicious, annoying, irritating, and oppressive. It takes one some little time to find out that phrases which seem intended to guide the reader aright are there to mislead him; that phrases which seem intended to throw light are there to throw darkness; that phrases which seem intended to interpret a fact are there to misinterpret it; that phrases which seem intended to forestall prejudice are there to create it; that phrases which seem antidotes are poisons in disguise. The naked facts arrayed in the book establish Shelley's guilt in that one episode which disfigures his otherwise superlatively lofty and beautiful life, but the historian's careful and methodical misinterpretation of them transfers the responsibility to the wife's shoulders—as he persuades himself. The few meagre facts of Harriet Shelley's life, as furnished by the book, acquit her of offence, but by calling in the forbidden helps of rumor, gossip, conjecture, insinuation, and innuendo, he destroys her character and rehabilitates Shelley's—as he believes. And in truth his unheroic work has not been barren of the results he aimed at; as witness the assertion made to me that girls in the colleges of America are taught that Harriet Shelley put a stain upon her husband's honor, and that that was what stung him into repurifying himself by deserting her and his child and entering into scandalous relations with a schoolgirl acquaintance of his.

If that assertion is true, they probably use a reduction of this work in those colleges, maybe only a sketch outlined from it. Such a thing as that could be harmful and misleading. They

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ought to cast it out and put the whole book in its place. It would not deceive. It would not deceive the janitor.

All of this book is interesting on account of the sorcerer's methods and the attractiveness of some of his characters and the repulsiveness of the rest, but no part of it is so much so as are the chapters wherein he tries to think he thinks he sets forth the causes which led to Shelley's desertion of his wife in 1814.

Harriet Westbrook was a schoolgirl sixteen years old. Shelley was teeming with advanced thought. He believed that Christianity was a degrading and selfish superstition, and he had a deep and sincere desire to rescue one of his sisters from it. Harriet was impressed by his various philosophies and looked upon him as an intellectual wonder—which indeed he was. He had an idea that she could give him valuable help in his scheme regarding his sister; therefore he asked her to correspond with him. She was quite willing. Shelley was not thinking of love, for he was just getting over a passion for his cousin, Harriet Grove, and just getting well steeped in one for Miss Hitchener, a school-teacher. What might happen to Harriet Westbrook before the letter-writing was ended, did not enter his mind. Yet an older person could have made a good guess at it, for in person Shelley was as beautiful as an angel, he was frank, sweet, winning, unassuming, and so rich in unselfishnesses, generosities, and magnanimities that he made his whole generation seem poor in these great qualities by comparison. Besides, he was in distress. His college had expelled him for writing an atheistical pamphlet and afflicting the reverend heads of the university with it, his rich father and grandfather had closed their purses against him, his friends were cold. Necessarily, Harriet fell in love with him ; and so deeply, indeed, that there was no way for Shelley to save her from suicide but to marry her. He believed himself to blame for this state of things, so the marriage took place. He was pretty fairly in love with Harriet, although he loved Miss Hitchener better. He wrote and explained the case to Miss Hitchener after the wedding, and he could not have been franker or more *naïve* and less stirred up about the circumstance if the matter in issue had been a commercial transaction involving thirty-five dollars.

Shelley was nineteen. He was not a youth, but a man. He had never had any youth. He was an erratic and fantastic child during eighteen years, then he stepped into manhood, as one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

steps over a doorsill. He was curiously mature at nineteen in his ability to do independent thinking on the deep questions of life and to arrive at sharply definite decisions regarding them, and stick to them—stick to them and stand by them at cost of bread, friendships, esteem, respect and approbation.

For the sake of his opinions he was willing to sacrifice all these valuable things, and did sacrifice them; and went on doing it, too, when he could at any moment have made himself rich and supplied himself with friends and esteem by compromising with his father, at the moderate expense of throwing overboard one or two indifferent details of his cargo of principles.

He and Harriet eloped to Scotland and got married. They took lodgings in Edinburgh of a sort answerable to their purse, which was about empty, and there their life was a happy one and grew daily more so. They had only themselves for company, but they needed no additions to it. They were as cosey and contented as birds in a nest. Harriet sang evenings or read aloud; also she studied and tried to improve her mind, her husband instructing her in Latin. She was very beautiful, she was modest, quiet, genuine, and, according to her husband's testimony, she had no fine lady airs or aspirations about her. In Matthew Arnold's judgment, she was "a pleasing figure."

The pair remained five weeks in Edinburgh, and then took lodgings in York, where Shelley's college mate, Hogg, lived. Shelley presently ran down to London, and Hogg took this opportunity to make love to the young wife. She repulsed him, and reported the fact to her husband when he got back. It seems a pity that Shelley did not copy this creditable conduct of hers some time or other when under temptation, so that we might have seen the author of his biography hang the miracle in the skies and squirt rainbows at it.

At the end of the first year of marriage—the most trying year for any young couple, for then the mutual failings are coming one by one to light, and the necessary adjustments are being made in pain and tribulation—Shelley was able to recognize that his marriage venture had been a safe one. As we have seen, his love for his wife had begun in a rather shallow way and with not much force, but now it was become deep and strong, which entitles his wife to a broad credit mark, one may admit. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addresses a long and loving poem to her, in which both passion and worship appear:

Exhibit A.

O thou
Whose dear love gleamed upon the gloomy path
Which this lone spirit traveled.
. . . . . .
. . . wilt thou not turn
Those spirit-beaming eyes and look on me,
Until I be assured that Earth is Heaven
And Heaven is Earth?
. . . . . .
Harriet! let death all mortal ties dissolve,
But ours shall not be mortal.

Shelley also wrote a sonnet to her in August of this same year in celebration of her birthday:

Exhibit B.

Ever as now with Love and Virtue's glow
May thy unwithering soul not cease to burn,
Still may thine heart with those pure thoughts o'erflow
Which force from mine such quick and warm return.

Was the girl of seventeen glad and proud and happy? We may conjecture that she was.

That was the year 1812. Another year passed—still happily, still successfully—a child was born in June, 1813, and in September, three months later, Shelley addresses a poem to this child, Ianthe, in which he points out just when the little creature is most particularly dear to him:

Exhibit C.

Dearest when most thy tender traits express
The image of thy mother's loveliness.

Up to this point the fabulist counsel for Shelley and prosecutor of his young wife has had easy sailing, but now his trouble begins, for Shelley is getting ready to make some unpleasant history for himself, and it will be necessary to put the blame of it on the wife.

Shelley had made the acquaintance of a charming gray-haired, young-hearted Mrs. Boinville, whose face "retained a certain youthful beauty"; she lived at Bracknell, and had a young daughter named Cornelia Turner, who was equipped with many fascinations. Apparently these people were sufficiently sentimental. Hogg says of Mrs. Boinville:

"The greater part of her associates were odious. I generally found

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there two or three sentimental young butchers, an eminently philosophical tinker, and several very unsophisticated medical practitioners or medical students, all of low origin and vulgar and offensive manners. They sighed, turned up their eyes, retailed philosophy, such as it was," etc.

Shelley moved to Bracknell, July 27 (this is still 1813), purposely to be near this unwholesome prairie-dogs' nest. The fabulist says: "It was the entrance into a world more amiable and exquisite than he had yet known."

"In this acquaintance the attraction was mutual"—and presently it grew to be very mutual indeed, between Shelley and Cornelia Turner, when they got to studying the Italian poets together. Shelley, "responding like a tremulous instrument to every breath of passion or of sentiment," had his chance here. It took only four days for Cornelia's attractions to begin to dim Harriet's. Shelley arrived on the 27th of July; on the 31st he wrote a sonnet to Harriet in which "one detects already the little rift in the lover's lute which had seemed to be healed or never to have gaped at all, when the later and happier sonnet to Ianthe was written"—in September, we remember:

Exhibit D.

EVENING. TO HARRIET.

O thou bright Sun! Beneath the dark blue line
Of western distance that sublime descendest,
And, gleaming lovelier as thy beams decline,
Thy million hues to every vapor lendest,
And over cobweb, lawn, and grove, and stream
Sheddest the liquid magic of thy light,
Till calm Earth, with the parting splendor bright,
Shows like the vision of a beauteous dream;
What gazer now with astronomic eye
Could coldly count the spots within thy sphere?
Such were thy lover, Harriet, could he fly
The thoughts of all that makes his passion dear,
And turning senseless from thy warm caress
Pick flaws in our close-woven happiness.

I cannot find the "rift"; still it may be there. What the poem *seems* to say, is, that a person would be coldly ungrateful who could consent to count and consider little spots and flaws in such a warm, great, satisfying sun as Harriet is. It is a "little rift which had seemed to be healed, *or* never to have gaped at all." That is, "one *detects*" a little rift which perhaps had never existed. How does one do that? How does one see the invisible? It is the fabulist's secret; he knows how to detect what does not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exist, he knows how to see what is not seeable; it is his gift, and he works it many a time to poor dead Harriet Shelley's deep damage.

"As yet, however, if there was a speck upon Shelley's happiness it was no more than a speck"—meaning the one which one detects where "it may never have gaped at all"—"nor had Harriet cause for discontent."

Shelley's Latin instructions to his wife had ceased. "From a teacher he had now become a pupil." Mrs. Boinville and her young married daughter Cornelia were teaching him Italian poetry; a fact which warns one to receive with some caution that other statement that Harriet had no "cause for discontent."

Shelley had stopped instructing Harriet in Latin, as before mentioned. The biographer thinks that the busy life in London some time back, and the intrusion of the baby, account for this. These were hindrances, but were there no others? He is always overlooking a detail here and there that might be valuable in helping us understand a situation. For instance, when a man has been hard at work at the Italian poets with a pretty woman, hour after hour, and responding like a tremulous instrument to every breath of passion or of sentiment in the meantime, that man is dog-tired when he gets home, and he *can't* teach his wife Latin; it would be unreasonable to expect it.

Up to this time we have submitted to having Mrs. Boinville pushed upon us as ostensibly concerned in these Italian lessons, but the biographer drops her now, of his own accord. Cornelia "perhaps" is sole teacher. Hogg says she was a prey to a kind of sweet melancholy, arising from causes purely imaginary; she required consolation, and found it in Petrarch. He also says, "Bysshe entered at once fully into her views and caught the soft infection, breathing the tenderest and sweetest melancholy, as every true poet ought."

Then the author of the book interlards a most stately and fine compliment to Cornelia, furnished by a man of approved judgment who knew her well "in later years." It is a very good compliment indeed, and she no doubt deserved it in her "later years," when she had for generations ceased to be sentimental and lackadaisical, and was no longer engaged in enchanting young husbands and sowing sorrow for young wives. But why is that compliment to that old gentlewoman intruded there? Is it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make the reader believe she was well-chosen and safe society for a young, sentimental husband? The biographer's device was not well planned. That old person was not present—it was her other self that was there, her young, sentimental, melancholy, warm-blooded self, in those early sweet times before antiquity had cooled her off and mossed her back.

"In choosing for friends such women as Mrs. Newton, Mrs. Boinville and Cornelia Turner, Shelley gave good proof of his insight and discrimination." That is the fabulist's opinion—Harriet Shelley's is not reported.

Early in August, Shelley was in London trying to raise money. In September he wrote the poem to the baby, already quoted from. In the first week of October Shelley and family went to Warwick, then to Edinburgh, arriving there about the middle of the month.

"Harriet was happy." Why? The author furnishes a reason, but hides from us whether it is history or conjecture; it is because "*the babe had borne the journey well.*" It has all the aspect of one of his artful devices—flung in in his favorite casual way—the way he has when he wants to draw one's attention away from an obvious thing and amuse it with some trifle that is less obvious but more useful—in a history like this. The obvious thing is, that Harriet was happy because there was much territory between her husband and Cornelia Turner now; and because the perilous Italian lessons were taking a rest; and because, if there chanced to be any responding like a tremulous instrument to every breath of passion or of sentiment in stock in these days, she might hope to get a share of them herself; and because, with her husband liberated, now, from the fetid fascinations of that sentimental retreat so pitilessly described by Hogg, who also dubbed it "Shelley's paradise" later, she might hope to persuade him to stay away from it permanently; and because she might also hope that his brain would cool, now, and his heart become healthy, and both brain and heart consider the situation and resolve that it would be a right and manly thing to stand by this girl-wife and her child and see that they were honorably dealt with, and cherished and protected and loved by the man that had promised these things, and so be made happy and kept so. And because, also—may we conjecture this?—we may hope for the privilege of taking up our cozy Latin lessons again, that used to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be so pleasant and brought us so near together—so near, indeed, that often our heads touched, just as heads do over Italian lessons; and our hands met in casual and unintentional, but still most delicious and thrilling little contacts and momentary clasps, just as they inevitably do over Italian lessons. Suppose one should say to any young wife: "I find that your husband is poring over the Italian poets and being instructed in the beautiful Italian language by the lovely Cornelia Robinson"—would that cozy picture fail to rise before her mind? would its possibilities fail to suggest themselves to her? would there be a pang in her heart and a blush on her face? or, on the contrary, would the remark give her pleasure, make her joyous and gay? Why, one needs only to make the experiment—the result will not be uncertain.

However, we learn—by authority of deeply-reasoned and searching conjecture—that the baby bore the journey well, and that that was why the young wife was happy. That accounts for two per cent. of the happiness, but it was not right to imply that it accounted for the other ninety-eight also.

Peacock, a scholar, poet, and friend of the Shelleys, was of their party when they went away. He used to laugh at the Boinville menagerie and "was not a favorite." One of the Boinville group, writing to Hogg, said, "The Shelleys have made an addition to their party in the person of a cold scholar, who, I think, has neither taste nor feeling. This, Shelley will perceive sooner or later, for his warm nature craves sympathy." True, and Shelley will fight his way back there to get it—there will be no way to head him off.

Toward the end of November it was necessary for Shelley to pay a business visit to London, and he conceived the project of leaving Harriet and the baby in Edinburgh with Harriet's sister, Eliza Westbrook, a sensible, practical maiden lady about thirty years old, who had spent a great part of her time with the family since the marriage. She was an estimable woman, and Shelley had had reason to like her, and did like her; but along about this time his feeling toward her changed. Part of Shelley's plan, as he wrote Hogg, was to spend his London evenings with the Newtons—members of the Boinville Hysterical Society. But, alas, when he arrived early in December, that pleasant game was partially blocked, for Eliza and the family

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arrived *with* him. We are left destitute of conjectures at this point by the biographer, and it is my duty to supply one. I chance the conjecture that it was Eliza who interfered with that game. I think she tried to do what she could toward modifying the Boinville connection, in the interest of her young sister's peace and honor.

If it was she who blocked that game, she was not strong enough to block the next one. Before the month and year were out—no date given, let us call it Christmas—Shelley and family were nested in a furnished house in Windsor, "at no great distance from the Boinvilles"—these decoys still residing at Bracknell.

What we need, now, is a misleading conjecture. We get it with characteristic promptness and depravity:

"But Prince Athanase found not the aged Zonoras, the friend of his boyhood, in any wanderings to Windsor. Dr. Lind had died a year since, and with his death Windsor must have lost, for Shelley, its chief attraction."

Still, not to mention Shelley's wife, there was Bracknell, at any rate. While Bracknell remains, all solace is not lost. Shelley is represented by this biographer as doing a great many careless things, but to my mind this hiring a furnished house for three months in order to be with a man who has been dead a year, is the carelessest of them all. One feels for him—that is but natural, and does us honor besides—yet one is vexed, for all that. He could have written and asked about the aged Zonoras before taking the house. He may not have had the address, but that is nothing—any postman would know the aged Zonoras; a dead postman would remember a name like that.

And yet, why throw a rag like this to us ravening wolves? Is it seriously supposable that we will stop to chew it and let our prey escape? No, we are getting to expect this kind of device, and to give it merely a sniff for certainty's sake and then walk around it and leave it lying. Shelley was not after the aged Zonoras; he was pointed for Cornelia and the Italian lessons, for his warm nature was craving sympathy.

MARK TWAIN.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

THE PROSPECTS OF MEXICO.

It will not surprise observers of Mexican affairs to find that Agustin de Iturbide, the adopted heir of the ill-fated Maximilian, complains of the "evil that has accrued to the Latin republics of America from the frenzy of their radical politicians for blind imitation of the institutions of the United States." This statement which he makes in the June number of this REVIEW, is entirely consistent with the narrow, retrograde policy of the followers of the first Iturbide, who, perhaps, knowing no better, tried to found an empire in the country which he had served to rescue from Spanish misrule. Fortunately the Liberator failed in that attempt, else the freedom for which Hidalgo and Morelos died might have profited little to the Mexican people. It is noteworthy that reactionary parties hide their sinister purpose by assailing liberal constitutions. In France, Boulanger concealed his Orleanist designs by demands for revision of the constitution. The extreme French radicals who would overturn the conservative republic of Thiers and Carnot are likewise ardent advocates of revision, while in Spain the name of Don Carlos is associated with rank toryism, utterly in conflict with the liberal principles engrafted on the constitution. The Mexican people love and reverence the constitution of 1857. It insures peaceful progress so far as any constitution can do so. So long as it is the supreme law no emperor, king, or dictator in the guise of president can exercise authority in Mexico. It represents the collective wisdom of the Mexican people, sharpened by long years of strife against domestic foes and foreign invasion. The constitution of 1857 has stood the test of thirty-seven years, during which the country has seen the rise and fall of dictatorships, imperial and otherwise, as well as a period of peace, that allowed the people to scrutinize the merits of the supreme law. Under it the republic has waxed strong and enjoyed liberty and prosperity. That the Mexican people cherish the republic and the supreme law which serves as its foundation was seen in their heroic resistance to the base attempt which Napoleon III., aided by Mexican traitors, made to establish an empire on the ruins of national liberty. The Mexicans contested bravely every inch of ground with the invaders and did not desist until they forced the tricolor, blazoned anew, as it was, with the victories of Sebastopol and Solferino, to retire before the indignation of an outraged people.

Prince Iturbide assails openly and by implication the administration of President Diaz. The merits of that administration can be estimated best by recalling the condition of the republic in 1876, when the victor of Puebla assumed the reins of power. Mexico was then the Ishmael of nations;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diplomatic intercourse was denied the republic by European powers, that had shown indecent haste in recognizing the empire which Napoleon III. had promoted to increase the prestige of the French army and check the influence of the United States on this continent. Even Secretary Evarts withheld the hearty, prompt recognition to which the new President was fairly entitled. The warm regard of General Diaz for this country, and his expressed desire to be on the most friendly terms with its government and people, were met with chilling indifference by the Hayes administration, which pressed its demands with a persistency that might have rendered Shylock green with envy. The financial as well as the industrial condition of the country was deplorable. The republic was without credit at home or abroad; there were no incorporated banks except the one London concern; silver was the only currency; no bills or notes were in circulation; the rates of domestic exchange were excessive. There was no railroad in this country of 763,000 square miles except that which connected the City of Mexico with the port of Vera Cruz, a distance of 263 miles. At the capital and throughout the interior crime was rampant, paralyzing industry and repelling the investment of foreign capital. In brief, Mexico was drifting towards absolute anarchy as fast as the most vicious anarchist could desire.

How different is now the condition of the sister republic! Mexico is on friendly terms with all the European powers. Her ministers are treated, with distinction at London and Paris, as well as at Berlin and Madrid. The misunderstandings with this country have given place to the friendliest intercourse, as might be seen by the splendid display of Mexican products at the World's Fair. The public credit has been restored, and the national finances have been put in good order. At the capital are the National Bank with an authorized capital of $20,000,000 ($8,000,000 paid up); the London Bank, whose capital is $5,000,000 ($3,000,000 paid up); and the International and Mortgage Bank, with like capital ($3,500,000 paid up). Banknotes redeemable in coin are in general use, facilitating trade and reducing the burdensome rates of domestic exchange. Two trunk railroads connect the capital with the Rio Grande, where they meet the American system, rendering it possible to make the journey from the City of Mexico to New York in 115 hours, and to Chicago in 94 hours. In addition to these trunk lines is another, which connects Durango with the Texan frontier at Eagle Pass. Branch lines from the Mexican Central to Guadalajara and Tampico open up extensive regions of both arable and mineral land, and provide the interior with ready access to an important port, much nearer to the United States seaboard than Vera Cruz. This remarkable progress in railroad building, fraught with great benefits to mining, agriculture, and manufactures, has been supplemented by the completion of another railroad from Vera Cruz to the capital, as well as by the construction of the railroad that extends from Puebla to Oaxaca, a line that may yet form part of the continental system that will extend from Hudson's Bay to Patagonia.

This material advancement has been attended with social and industrial progress. Order reigns throughout the republic. The Rio Grande border has ceased to be associated with disorder. American and European capital has been invested freely in mines and manufactures. Public schools have been established in large number, while hearty encouragement has been given to all researches calculated to benefit mining and agriculture.

As the result of the gratifying progress in railroad building and public improvements, the domestic and foreign trade of the republic has increased

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

considerably. Despite the depressing influence of the unstable price of silver, the annual exports and imports in recent years are largely in excess of those in the years that preceded the Diaz *régime*, affording assurance that when a reciprocitytreaty is negotiated the commerce of Mexico with this country will expand rapidly. This mere outline of what has been done since General Diaz became president must satisfy impartial observers that the wish is father to the thought, when Prince Iturbide declares that "a general feeling of impending collapse is noticeable throughout the country." In the presence of such growth no "collapse" is possible.

The general effect of the Diaz *régime* has been to demonstrate the blessings of peace and to exorcise that malign spirit which would gloat over a "collapse," and seek redress of grievances, real or imaginary, by conspiracy and armed force. Such revolutionists raised in that school as remain are now old in years and have lost the potent influence which they exercised formerly in state and national affairs. In their place has grown up a generation of young men, educated in the public schools and trained to live by honest labor. These young men are the hope of Mexico. They possess the martial spirit of their race, but they are firm supporters of law and order. More than the authority of any executive they will serve to keep Mexico in the paths of peace and establish a healthy state of public opinion.

Prince Iturbide sees fit to denounce the financial policy of the present Mexican Government. There was a time when the Mexican finances were as puzzling as the Schleswig-Holstein question. They are no longer involved in what seemed inextricable confusion. During his first term President Diaz, aided by mercantile concerns, conducted the government without severe financial stress. The reforms that he made in the military and civil service sufficed to make the receipts and expenses measurably correspond. The average annual revenue from 1867 to 1877 had been only $16,000,000, owing to the inability of the government to collect more, as well as to the depressed condition of the country. But when the blunders and wastefulness of the Gonzalez administration (1880–84), combined with the railroad subsidies, had depleted the treasury, the financial situation created the gloomiest forebodings. President Diaz, who had been re-elected in 1884, met the emergency with his customary resolution. With the full concurrence of Congress he consolidated the public debt and effected an agreement with the British bondholders whereby the payment of interest was resumed on the securities held by them, amounting to about $65,000,000. This heroic act of national honesty was politic as well as just. It placed Mexico on good terms with the financial world. It opened to her, especially, the exchanges of London, Paris, and Berlin. It is said that even Prince Bismarck lent the sanction of his sound judgment to the financial aid which the German bankers gave Mexico. Mexican enterprises were no longer banned by European financiers. Foreign capital was invested freely in Mexican companies. Important public improvements of a productive character were initiated. The public credit improved so much that the treasury was able to make a satisfactory arrangement for temporary loans with the National Bank, as well as to effect abroad a loan whereby it paid off the railroad subsidies that formed a vexatious lien on the revenue from import duties. This financial revival was attended by the development of the banking system, which has provided the country with a sound paper currency, redeemable in silver coin by the banks themselves. Prince Iturbide asserts that President Diaz has "burdened Mexico with a debt of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$200,000,000." In the light of the foregoing facts the value of that delusive statement may be estimated.

These financial reforms, of course, rendered it imperative to increase the public revenne. This was an arduous task, owing to the comparative poverty of the people, and to the stubborn resistance which wealthy landowners have offered to all forms of direct taxation. It was difficult also to derive more revenue from the customs without crippling the foreign trade or retarding tariff reforms, designed to promote home industry without impairing the protection which it received. The Mexican Government, assisted by a patriotic Congress, proved equal to the emergency. In the year 1878–79 the public revenue was $17,811,125 (silver), whereof $10,464,677 was derived from customs, and $7,346,448 from internal taxation. Eight years later, in 1886–87, the revenue was $32,126,000, whereof customs yielded $17,-268,000, and internal taxation $14,858,000. Thus did Mexico bravely undertake to meet her public engagements. By the exercise of rigid economy the treasury defrayed the government expenses and paid the interest on the public debt, with a sum much less than the public expenditures of the city of New York, which were, in 1892, $32,389,389.23 in gold coin.

There is no warrant for the assumption which Prince Iturbide makes so glibly that President Diaz has established a dictatorship. His retirement from office at the close of his first term will satisfy most people that his heart was not set on arbitrary power. He respects rigidly the national constitution. He has not encroached on the authority of Congress nor on the independence of the judiciary. His cabinet ministers have included statesmen of high character, such as Romero, Mariscal, Romero-Rubio, and Limantour. Such men could not be parties to a dictatorship. They belong by training and reputation to a different school. That President Diaz is now serving a fourth term in no way implies danger to the republican institutions of his country. Under like circumstances Washington or Lincoln might have deemed it a patriotic duty to remain in office.

The general stability of Mexico is secure. The discovery of coalfields in the north, the growth of the ore traffic with the United States, the establishment of extensive reduction works at San Luis Potosi, the application of American methods and capital to mining, the increase in the production of sugar, coffee, and tobacco—all these, combined with the steady accumulation of wealth, impart strength to the commonwealth and inspire confidence in its advancement. The decline in the value of silver, of course, causes some concern at the national treasury and among foreign traders, but it does not affect so seriously the large volume of domestic commerce which is carried on with little regard to the fluctations in the price of the white metal. The prospects of the country are also rendered brighter by the undoubted capacity of its soil to raise the sugar, coffee, fruits, and other tropical products for which this country disburses over $100,000,000 annually. Nor can the time be remote, when in this "irrigation age," it will be found that the exhaustless supplies of water beneath the Mexican soil are really a greater source of wealth than her mines of gold and silver, which yielded over $3,000,000,000 in the period from 1537 to 1880.

The actual figures render more striking the foregoing details concerning the general development of Mexico. In the year 1888–89 the revenue was $34,374,783; the expenditures, $75,823,310. In the current fiscal year, which will end June 30, 1895, the revenue is estimated at $43,074,053, while the expenditure is not expected to exceed $43,054,371. The total debt, June 30,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1892, was $174,449,510, most of which was incurred long before General Diaz came into power. In 1893 Mexico had 6,900 miles of railway, the gross earnings being $23,000,000. The capital invested up to 1891 in these railroads by English companies was £14,601,380 sterling, and by American companies $254,126,249 (United States coin). The registered capital of companies formed in London (railway, land, and mining) for operations wholly or in part in Mexico amounted in the years 1886-92 to the large sum of £53,214,827 sterling. The coinage of the Mexican mints for the ten years—1882-83 to 1891-92—was $259,405,695, an annual average of nearly $26,000,000. This coinage was mostly silver. The resources of the three banks already named amounted in 1893 to $81,354,571. The foreign commerce grew with the general growth of the country, the imports for the year 1889-90 having been $52,018,659; the exports $62,499,388. The bulk of this trade was with the United States, the new railroads having turned the commercial current strongly in this direction. In 1873 the imports were only $28,000,000; the exports only $25,500,000.

WALTER MEADE O'DWYER.

THE DANGERS OF VACCINATION.

A NEW HAMPSHIRE farmer took an orphan boy to bring up; the boy told the neighbors that he was regularly whipped without being accused of wrongdoing. One of them made cautious inquiries. The old farmer said: "John is as good a boy as I ever saw." "But he says you whip him. Is that so?" "Yes," said the old man, "I whip him for fear he will be ugly."

Thus, for fear we may get sick if exposed to the contagion of smallpox, the old and the young, the weak and the strong, those who never take any disease and those of impure life and blood—all are compelled to be made sick. Compelling general vaccination because a few cases of smallpox have occurred in any community is as absurd as punishing children for fear they will do wrong. If this method of prevention is so successful, why not empower the physicians to bleed and physic the community spring and fall to ward off other diseases? This custom was certainly in vogue in Jenner's time. But let us inquire: Is vaccination a protection? Does it really modify smallpox, or is the disease naturally milder in some cases than in others, as is the case in other contagious diseases? To what extent does it aid in suppressing the disease?

Is it our sole reliance in stamping out smallpox? or are sanitary measures as potent in this as in other diseases tending to become epidemic? Has the great progress of this century in medical science and sanitary knowledge *no* influence in controlling and modifying its results? Is not vaccination credited with all these influences in making up statistics? Does an array of statistics *pro* and *con* settle so vital a question? During our civil war the writer had charge of an inclosure where there were 1,500 men and the smallpox among them; every person within the inclosure who could be persuaded to submit to the operation was vaccinated, and a careful record was kept of each case; many of those vaccinated, where all the requirements of "Jenner" were fulfilled, had the confluent smallpox, while several, who had never been vaccinated, had the lightest kind of so-called varioloid. Though educated to believe in vaccination, the nine months' experience caused me to doubt its efficacy, and subsequent investigation and personal experience have produced a well-grounded belief that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vaccination is the best perfected and most dangerous humbug the world ever saw.

Vaccination originated in the idea that kinepox bears the same relation to the animal that smallpox does to man, though the former only affects the female, while the latter is no respecter of sex. As kinepox never shows itself upon the male animal, the disease is not taken into the system by the food or drink of the cow, else it would affect male and female alike. Dr. Jenner traced the disease in the cow to the hands of milkmen, who milked the cows after working over horses that had the grease or scratches, but the record does not show whether it was the diseased horses or the remedies used to cure the scratches that caused the kinepox.

Kinepox is extremely rare now, for everybody knows enough to wash his hands after handling diseased animals. Had Dr. Jenner's milkmen known the importance of washing their hands before milking the cows, what an immense amount of suffering their knowledge would have saved the human family. Is it surprising under such circumstances that it was difficult to get the proper virus? Then, as now, it is only known by its results. If vaccinated and you escape having smallpox, "the virus was good." If you had the disease lightly, "the virus was good." If you had smallpox after recent vaccination, "the virus was not good." If not vaccinated recently, "it had run out." If you suffer unusually after vaccination, you have the satisfaction of knowing it must have been "impure virus." If smallpox became epidemic, "it was for want of general vaccination or the use of poor virus." If it decreased, "it was the result of vaccination." The *doubt* as to getting the proper virus has really been the *strongest* element in maintaining Jenner's system of vaccination, for it furnished an ever-ready explanation of all its failures as well as apparent success. We have shown that the whole system was born of ignorance, doubt, and uncertainty, and we propose to show that it is continued without any positive knowledge as to what its results will be; that it is opposed to reason and common-sense and unsupported by medical science or hygiene; that those who ought to direct public opinion on the subject have a *strong* incentive to favor its continuance; that no fair estimate of the ill results of vaccination can be made so long as—for obvious reasons—they are suppressed by those best qualified to speak of them; that what physicians *know* about vaccination is but "a drop in the bucket" in comparison to what they *do not* know. No one knows whether the virus is good or bad, except by its results. No one knows whether the virus will be taken into the system or thrown off, and if absorbed no one is wise enough to foretell what its results will be, because no one knows anything of the individual's susceptibility to poison or contagion.

No man is wise enough to divine the result of putting any animal poison into the system of anybody by vaccination; it may be harmless, or it may be like a spark to the magazine, setting in motion unseen or dormant forces which shall injure health or result in death.

To illustrate: A woman, who had not had occasion to call a physician for more than twenty years, was compelled to be vaccinated. Her arm became fearfully swollen, the disease extended, and she died after six weeks of intense suffering. The physician vaccinated others the same day with the same virus, and half of them experienced the usual results; in the rest it did not take. No one could say she would have had the smallpox if exposed, she preferred to take the risk, and should have been allowed to die a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

natural death, instead of suffering by law tenfold more than the vilest criminal. Such is the modifying influence of age, constitution, and habits of life that no physician will admit that he treats all his patients alike, though they have the same disease; yet people are vaccinated indiscriminately, made sick lest they should have a disease that no person on earth is wise enough to say they would have, even if exposed. Physicians will acknowledge that what they do *not know* about the individual need of vaccination and its *modus operandi* greatly exceeds their *positive* knowledge, and the reason lies in the fact that the whole system is at variance with the rules that govern them in the control of other diseases of contagious character. Instead of making people *sick* at the approach of other forms of contagion, they enjoin the most careful living and avoidance of everything that tends to make people ill.

Our knowledge of other means of preventing and modifying smallpox has a solid basis of common sense, well sustained by science and experience, and equally adapted to all forms of contagious diseases; which, though vigorously applied, and effectively, the results are all credited to vaccination. All diseases resulting from contagion and liable to become epidemic have a period of incubation, development, and decline, while each follows its own law, the infection of measles never producing any disease but measles, and so of each form, and the variation as to mildness or severity is due to its environment. Contagion is like a plant in that it must find a soil suited to its growth, or it is of no effect—harmless; hence it is that one person in a family may have smallpox and all the rest escape, as in the following instance. The writer found a returned soldier in the second stage of smallpox, surrounded by parents and a large family of children, who had never been vaccinated. The soldier was sent to the pest-house, the family out of doors and vaccinated, while the house was thoroughly fumigated; result, no one had the smallpox, nor did the vaccination take in any case. Of those in whom the contagion does find a lodgment, the resulting disease is more or less severe, according to the general health and condition of the individual.

The fundamental facts, upon which all authorities agree, experience corroborating them, are that careful living and good health do not only ward off contagious disease but greatly modify it; that the severity of contagious disease depends upon the condition of the blood. It must therefore logically follow that good health, or a pure condition of the blood, will protect from and modify smallpox in the *same* ratio as it does in measles, scarlet fever, or other forms of contagious disease. If such is the case—and who will deny it?—there are no claims made for vaccination that this well-established principle does not fully explain and account for; they are simply the result of well known and established principles, eqally applicable to all forms of disease.

Can it be that He "who spake as never man spake" did not anticipate the wisdom of "Jenner" and his followers when he said, "They that are whole have no need of the physician"? He comes *now* without being called, with lancet and lymph, to make the healthy infant and the octogenarian sick.

Is it not better to destroy contagion by the use of disinfectants than to try to control it and modify its results by polluting the "crimson stream of life" with an animal poison of doubtful origin, the consequences of which no person can foretell?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Like every other evil that infests society, vaccination has its pecuniary incentives. Every smallpox scare in our large cities changes upwards of $100,000 from the citizens' pockets to those of the physicians, which, it is natural to suppose, inclines them to indorse "the popular whim," and makes it so difficult to get an unbiased record of the disastrous consequences of vaccination. How often has the writer heard physicians say, "I do not believe in Jenner's system of vaccination, but as long as people do, and want to be vaccinated, I shall gratify them"!

We believe those quoted represent so large a class that, were physicians required to perform the service gratuitously, the system would not be continued a decade. To compel old and young, the strong and the weak, the healthy and those enfeebled by disease, to submit to vaccination, under existing circumstances, is certainly a dangerous expedient, not warranted by reason or our knowledge of its results.

WILLIAM B. HIDDEN, M. D.

IS COUNTRY LIFE LONELY?

IT is often solitary, retired, to a certain degree; but does a secluded life in the country necessarily breed a feeling of lonesomeness, irksome discontent, and a homesickness for the city? This is a question that must interest any who contemplate a change from city to country. One will say the answer depends on the person who makes that change, and the answer has much truth. Another will say that it depends on the location of the country home, and that, too, has an important bearing. A house situated in a low, narrow valley, with no other habitation in sight, surrounded by woods and swamps, with scarce a lovely object in view, would indeed be lonely. It ought to be lonely, and it ought to breed such discontent as to drive the owner to seek a more cheerful location. I will add to these two important answers this third one: That one's lonesomeness in the country depends largely upon one's will, one's attitude toward the country. If you begin country life feeling that you are a foreigner to it, and never intend to be naturalized, then you doom yourself to dislike it. Nature will never adopt you into her larger liberties unless you will be adopted, and the shy denizens of bush and brake will never greet you as a fellow-citizen. But if you drop this alien spirit and resolve to conquer the country life by openly surrendering to its charms, then you will win a gratifying success.

A young couple hired a pretty farm cottage near the writer last year. They were people of the sanguine sort. They took a three-years lease of it, with the intent of buying. The man was not without conceit. He thought he knew all about the country, all about farming. He asked no advice and took none. He hired a man at high wages to run the farm. The house was newly painted and the rooms were decorated, so as to resemble a gaudy city apartment-house. The man had to be in the city long hours every day but Sunday. He gave orders to his farmer, and the farmer tried his best to carry them out. The newcomer's ideas of farming were fearfully and wonderfully made. Of course the young husband was a loving spouse, and the pair had no end of pretty little names that they called each other before the country folk. Otherwise they would never have stayed the summer through. But long before autumn the young amateur farmer had quarreled with his hired man, and both had to consult lawyers. Another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fine quarrel began with the landlord. The young wife—she was very young with a young child—got unutterably homesick. Early in the fall they compromised the lease, sacrificed their new tools and implements, abandoned fruits and crops and the glorious air and tinted leaves of autumn, and fled back to a "nice little flat in the city."

Did they like the country? No, if one may judge from their reports in the city! "It was the most lonesome place, and everything was so disagreeable!" Did they know how to enjoy the country? That is the more pertinent question. Eyes had they, but they saw not. They never were seen to walk through woods or fields. They never called on a neighbor. They were so "lonesome" that they stayed in that little, newly decorated room as if it had been their prison, or indeed a flat on a twelfth floor. They cultivated no plant or flower with their own hands, nor personally cared for any animals, pets or poultry. They did go driving in a stiff, sedate fashion, with a boy driver. Tennis, rowing, fishing, swimming, croquet, sketching, botanizing, baseball, cricket, lawn parties? No, they were not for them! They were too "lonesome." Straw-rides by the light of the moon? The idea would have given them a shock.

Of course these people deserved their fate. But there are many sensible, cultivated, open-air sort of people who will get lonesome and homesick on the average country farm, for instance. It is true. Let us confess, we have been lonely ourselves. But let us not forget that it may be a good thing to be lonely sometimes. To paraphrase an old proverb, in loneliness there is strength. The lone tree is the broad tree, rugged, storm-defiant. "'Tis a good thing sometimes to be alone," wrote a wise poet. There are times when the spirit in man urges to seclusion. When a man is lonely, the eternal Verities speak to him, as they may not speak in a crowd.

A man need not be unhappy because he is solitary. Ask the spirit of Robinson Crusoe—unreal creation that outlives realities—if he did not more greatly enjoy his life on the desert island than any experiences in the haunts of civilized man. Every little farm, or country cottage, or artist's box in the woods, may be a Crusoe's island to any one with the adventurous, appreciative spirit of Defoe's hero. We follow "Leatherstocking" through the forest, and are charmed with his intimacy with nature, a reverent familiarity that leads him, step by step, "through nature up to nature's God." Yet any one may be educated by the forest if he goes there, as to another university, intending to learn. We are not to imitate "Hawkeye," nor imitate anything, but to listen, and to welcome the awful loneliness of the woods until we get a message from it, remembering that often the lonely lives have been the great lives, and that the true lover speaks only when there is no third party present. There is a plant in the hotbed or greenhouse. It is crowded, growing tall, indeed, but spindling. If you leave it there it may possibly blossom, but will bear little if any fruit. Transplant it to a free, broad space in the open air; ah, it wilts! It is "lonely." The sun strikes it down, and storms beat it into the dust. But care for it, watch it, and soon it begins a broad, sturdy growth, blossoms, fruits, and becomes what it never would have been in the hotbed.

C. H. CRANDALL.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED